



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



A 473055

DUPL

PROPERTY OF
*University of
Michigan
Libraries*
1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

A 473055

DUPL

PROPERTY OF
*University of
Michigan
Libraries*
1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS



A 473055

DUPL

PROPERTY OF
*University of
Michigan
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

P. H. Bhattacharjee

HISTORICAL STUDIES

AND RECREATIONS.

K. Bhattacharyya

HISTORICAL STUDIES

AND RECREATIONS.

BY

SHOSHEE CHUNDER DUTT,

RÁI BÁHÁDOOR,

AUTHOR OF "A VISION OF SUMERU AND OTHER POEMS," "BENGALIANA," ETC.

"Does a man speak foolishly? Suffer him gladly, for ye are wise. Does he speak erroneously? Stop such a man's mouth with sound words, that cannot be gainsaid. Does he speak truly? Rejoice in the truth."—CROMWELL.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

THE WORLD'S HISTORY RETOLD.

IN TWO PARTS.

I.—*THE ANCIENT WORLD.*

II.—*THE MODERN WORLD.*

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.

1879.

All rights reserved.

D
7
.525
v.1

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE AND HANSON, EDINBURGH
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

565596-234

K. Bhattacharya

ADVERTISEMENT.

OF the five works included in these volumes, three were originally published by the author under the *nom de plume* of J. A. G. Barton, while the fourth and fifth have appeared, in part only, in the pages of two Indian Magazines. Their collection in the form in which they are now presented has hardly any justification, except in the author's wish to bring them all forward a second time before the reading public. Those which appeared in book form before were largely, and, for the most part, very indulgently reviewed, and extracts from some of these notices are appended to the second volume.

The inaccuracies of style and grammar which the English reader may stumble over in wading through these volumes are sufficiently accounted for by the avowal of authorship now made. Further apology on that score seems scarcely to be called for.

71, MUSJEEDBÁREE STREET, CALCUTTA.

1st March, 1879.

CONTENTS
OF
THE FIRST VOLUME.

THE ANCIENT WORLD.	
CHAP.	PAGE
I. PREFATORY REMARKS	I
II. CHINA	14
III. INDIA	34
IV. PERSIA	54
V. ASSYRIA, MEDIA, LYDIA, AND TARTARY	71
VI. PHOENICIA, SYRIA, PALESTINE, AND ARABIA . .	91
VII. EGYPT	111
VIII. GREECE	128
IX. ROME	146
X. RÉSUMÉ	164
INDEX	185

THE MODERN WORLD.	
I. PREFATORY REMARKS	195
II. GREAT BRITAIN	204
III. THE DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE .	236
IV. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	263

CHAP.	PAGE
V. FRANCE; OR, THE <i>GRANDE NATION</i>	287
VI. GERMANY	320
VII. RUSSIA	350
VIII. THE MINOR STATES OF EUROPE	386
IX. THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF ASIA, AFRICA, AND AMERICA.	415
X. RÉSUMÉ	434
INDEX	455

THE ANCIENT WORLD.

CHAPTER I.

PREFATORY REMARKS.

A REVIEW of the history of the earlier ages will probably not be unacceptable to the readers of the present day. The subject is an interesting one, and can never cease to be instructive. We are all more or less anxious to know who those ancient nations were who lived and flourished when Europe was covered with forests and sprinkled over with savages; how they were connected with each other; in what characteristic peculiarities they agreed, and in what they differed; what were their several pursuits, and what their respective and relative attainments. As yet our inquiries on these points have certainly not been exhausted. We still wish to ascend the stream of history a little further, to observe, if possible, the different stages of ancient development, with which the development of subsequent ages is so intimately allied. The different parts of the universe are mutually and very familiarly connected with each other. The Chinese, the Hindus, the Persians, the Assyrians, and the Egyptians, did not exist for nothing; and the Greeks and Romans only carried to greater perfection that knowledge which they derived from their predecessors. The germs of the intellect we admire in Greece and Rome existed from a prior date. Plato says that his countrymen derived all their knowledge from the ancients, who "were wiser, and lived nearer to the gods, than we." How did those wiser nations originate? How did they

gradually unfold themselves? What was their first simple state of existence? How did more complex relations arise? These are questions which ought to repay every exertion made to elucidate them.

The difficulties which surround the subject are admittedly great. The primitive annals of all nations are necessarily based on traditions; and these traditions, originally uncertain, have, in the course of ages, become much more so, having, on the one hand, been mutilated by time, and, on the other, embellished or disfigured by poets and rhetoricians. Of the oldest times we possess fragments only: some in the shape of verses, others in that of uncertain genealogies of kings. Of some nations there have been no records of any kind whatever; of others a great part of such records as did exist has been lost or destroyed. Of all nations the written accounts that survive were thrown into that form long after the age of the events recorded, and must presumably, to a great extent, be spurious. Absolute accuracy and completeness of result cannot therefore well be hoped for from any investigation conducted under such circumstances: where the premises are so imperfect and uncertain, the conclusions built upon them can never be wholly perfect and accurate. It is the fashion to assert that an inquiry where everything is so vague and doubtful must be utterly useless. It appears to us that it is precisely such an inquiry (carried on under disadvantages of a character so peculiar, and every scintillation of light thrown over which is a gain to knowledge and humanity) that is of real benefit to mankind; and that even our very conjectures and inferences in connection with it, where legitimately derived from the traditions reviewed, are absolutely of greater value than repetitions of veritable accounts of modern wars and achievements with which we are constantly inundated. The series of information for all the past may not admit of being completed; we cannot expect to be able to lay before the world the annals of the primitive ages in their integrity. But the main features of their history can still be rendered clear enough for all useful pur-

poses by a little exertion; the obscurity now resting on them can be dissipated; the fiction within which they are enshrouded can be removed: and any service thus rendered to the cause of truth ought to be of some use to mankind.

The difficulties of the inquiry have been very unnecessarily increased by the dislocation or wholesale rejection of all annals and traditions which do not correspond with the books of the Jewish people; these last having been most arbitrarily assumed to be absolutely correct and complete, though, apart from their religious authority, they have no inherent right to be regarded as our sole or main guides in remote antiquity. In all inquiries of this nature, it should rather be laid down as a fundamental rule that the annals of each nation concerned are *primâ facie* entitled to credence where they are not outrageously unworthy of belief; because it only stands to reason that each country should be the best custodian of the records relating to itself. Traditional knowledge, says Müller, is the germ of humanity, wisdom, and learning; and we cannot afford to refuse any information that comes up to us in that shape merely because it will not square with the system laid down in the Genesis, which, in matters distinct from religion, is not infallible. We would not reject national traditions even when they are contradictory, or to some extent gross and absurd, since there may be a great proportion of truth in them, mixed up with possibly a greater proportion of what is mythical and untrue; and, even if it should be impracticable to separate the pure metal from the dross, we would rather receive the whole compound under a protest, than throw it away altogether. This, in fact, is the course we invariably follow in other similar cases where the question of Bible history is not involved. We do not refuse, for instance, to believe in Homer and the Trojan war, or even in Válmik and the *Rámáyana*, though we have no certain information in respect to either, and though much that is related of them is assuredly mythical and untrue. Why, then, in the absence of accurate information, should we refuse to accept the evidence of China, Persia, and Egypt in regard to them-

selves, merely because such evidence does not correspond with, or directly contradicts, the testimony of the Jewish books? The argument frequently urged that the evidence from other sources consists mainly of distortions of the Bible account, the same story being presented in different garbs from different quarters, simply begs the question that it ought to prove. The countries of the ancient world were all simultaneously peopled and simultaneously civilised, and the accounts in regard to them must necessarily be similar to some extent; but, if similar, they are not the same in all or many respects, while in certain respects they are directly opposed to each other, which in itself is a proof that they are not derived from the same source. Captain Troyer, in his translation of *Rājāh Tarangini*, writes that "after reducing to their lowest possible values all the historical traditions and chronological data of the Chinese, Hindus, Persians, Phœnicians, Egyptians, and other nations, . . . I cannotre fuse credence to this fact—namely, that great states highly advanced in civilisation existed at least three thousand years before our era." This must be the inevitable conclusion of every such inquiry; and, if we once admit that these great states did exist so early, a further inquiry forces itself upon us in respect to the manner in which they succeeded in attaining their greatness. It is simply absurd to assume that the same legislators and the same inventors of the arts and sciences perambulated the whole universe to instruct all mankind. Everything is now attributed to Adam and Eve to commence with, and then to Noah and his descendants from the time of the flood; but, if all of them had strolled over the globe throughout the whole period of their lives, they would scarcely have been able to achieve a fourth part of what is supposed to have originated with them. The absurdity of our general belief on this point is so apparent that it is strange that we have never attempted to rectify it. It is still in our power to do so, the history of the ancient world not having yet been altogether lost to us. We have only to admit the evidence which we have hitherto refused

in respect to it, to remove it from the region of total doubt and uncertainty; and, if even then we find ourselves unable to solve all our difficulties thoroughly, we shall at least not perversely continue to misunderstand the nature of the problem we have to deal with. Much of the evidence which we propose to accept has a fabulous character; but these are just the fables we must not wholly reject, since what we call fables were probably truths in the ages in which they were written, when they were correctly understood. No nation as a body of men would or could have gratuitously invented a series of mere stories to palm them off on posterity as historical facts. What they did was to dress their history in such garb as appeared pleasing to them without being open to misconstruction in their day. We have only to find out the sense the narration was intended to convey; nor ought any man to be censured on the score of presumption for attempting to do so.

Of all the accounts available to us, the oldest in point of compilation are the five books of Moses, which give us what is considered to be the most authentic and genuine report of the world—so far as they go. But they only profess to furnish a general history of mankind up to the period of the flood, and from an excess of light at the outset, leave us darkling through the ages that follow. The next records in point of time are the *Veds* and the *Puráns* of the Hindus, which are purely mythical, and barely afford light to make the darkness of their subject visible. Of China, the *Shúking* contains annals going as far back as B.C. 2300, and they appear to be generally very reliable, though the record possibly was not compiled previous to the first century before Christ. Of Persia, the very ancient accounts given in the *Dabistán* and the *Zendávestá*, though mostly fabulous, contain a large sprinkling of truth which may well receive attention, even though we may not feel perfectly sure of our ground till we begin to receive the corroborative testimony of the western writers. Egypt had no historian till the age of Ptolemy Philadelphus, when Manetho, the high priest, was ordered to write its history; but the history that

he did write then was collated with veritable records and inscriptions on national monuments, and would seem to have been generally believed in. The works of Berosus and Abydenus on the Chaldean empire were not written till after the time of Alexander the Great, notwithstanding which all their contents were certainly not utterly fabulous. Sanchoniatho, who wrote the *Phœnician Antiquities*, was of older date, being supposed by some to have been contemporaneous with David, and by others with the Trojan war; and his testimony, as one of the very oldest on the subject, is entitled to receive the highest consideration. We might have been able to derive much confirmatory assistance also from several other attempts which were made in the earlier ages to collect floating traditions, had they come down to us. Democritus wrote a history of Phrygia, Zanthus of Lydia, Anacharsis of Scythia, Aristippus of Lybia, Heraclides of Persia, and Dius, Moschus, and others, of Phœnicia. But all these have been lost. What remains of Sanchoniatho now is an adulterated and confused medley; of Manetho we have but a garbled second-hand abridgment by Syncellus; of Berosus, some detached passages and fragments only have been rescued. But instead of regretting that our position is not better than it is, we should rather be thankful that it is not worse.

The Mosaic account is very simple and clear. Man is formed out of the dust, but in the image of his Maker; the first pair are placed in Eden—that is, start in life with the greatest felicity; sin enters even among them, and, as a necessary consequence of it, they are cast out from their felicity and made subject to death; the disorders increase, and sin becomes rampant as the family multiplies; the whole human race becomes incorrigibly corrupt, and are therefore all destroyed by a flood: but, God being grieved at heart that it should be so, Noah finds grace in His eyes, and he and his family are saved to repeople an empty world.

We may stop here to ask, whether this account, apparently true so far as it goes, is at the same time complete? Another

account, only less ancient than the Mosaic one, is that given by Sanchoniatho. His first man and wife, on being created, find out the food gathered from trees, and the way of generating fire by rubbing pieces of wood against each other. They increase and multiply vastly, the beings procreated bearing the names afterwards venerated in Egypt and Greece as those of gods and goddesses. They live in the most brutal state of prostitution and crime; but no destruction of the world by a flood is spoken of. Is this necessarily false because it does not absolutely tally with the other account? or should we not rather accept it as based on a different tradition of the first ages from what Moses knew? China, Persia, and Egypt similarly give us distinct and differing stories of their own, which are not necessarily false, and which, differing from the Mosaic account, do not necessarily impugn its correctness. The fact, which lies in a nutshell, is this, that the account of the Bible is only true and complete as far as it goes—that is, as far as the knowledge available to Moses could have made it so. In respect to subsidiary details, it would seem to be not absolutely or nearly accurate. The whole world was not possibly destroyed by the deluge, as Moses relates. Here we are bound to accept the additional evidence available to us on that particular point. The Persian and Phœnician versions give no account of the deluge at all; the account furnished by the Chinese, which is unimpeachable, is that there was a deluge which did great mischief, but that all mankind did not perish by it; and the account of Berosus expressly limits the inundation and destruction to Assyria, of which only the annals compiled by him took cognizance. These divergences from the account of Moses only explain that what Moses knew to have been universally destructive, actually did much less damage in other parts of the world not known to the Jews, and was scarcely felt in some of them; and this surely must have been true. The mountains of Armenia, where the ark rested, are said to have been covered only with fifteen cubits of water. This alone, if it was so, is sufficient evidence to establish that the

high table-land of Central Asia (known as the Pamir land, or the roof of the world, being the most elevated region in it), the mountainous regions of Irán, of the Himálayas, and of China, and other equally great heights in other countries, were not wholly, and some, perhaps, not even partially, flooded by what, naturally enough, appeared to those in the ark and their historians to have been universal and all-destructive. The records of other nations also show that, in the same manner as Noah and his family were saved in one country, there were other families saved from the general destruction in other lands; and of this one very simple proof has been adduced,—namely, that the American continent is rife with animals unknown in the Old World, which must have been preserved there on the heights of the stupendous mountains of that continent, if the flood visited it at all. And if animals were thus saved, why not men? And if men and animals in America were so saved, why not elsewhere also? There are other attendant proofs, too, of much force. According to the Mosaic account the flood subsided in B.C. 2348, after having lasted about one year. There is sufficient evidence to show that China was well peopled in B.C. 2205; and it is more than probable that India, Persia, Tartary, and Egypt had various modes of society and government at about the same period, certainly within two hundred years after. That one family, however prolific, and however especially favoured by Providence, should have been able to migrate to, and people all those regions, so distant from each other, within a short period of three or four centuries, is not credible; apart from which we also find that, from the time when their traditions commence, the races in them were as distinct from each other as they are now, or possibly more distinct from each other than at present, which of itself nullifies the belief that they were all derived from one common stock. In respect to such details, therefore, the Mosaic account does need whatever further amplification other supplemental accounts may be able to furnish.

By what process the world was really planted it is of

course very hard now to determine. All inquiries on the subject seem to have led to a general conviction that the whole human race has been derived from one primary stock, the cradle of which was in Asia, though it is difficult to point out with precision the particular spot where it stood. With the first part of this conclusion we do not agree. The five principal nations of Asia in ancient times were the Hindus, the Chinese, the Persians, the Tartars, and the Arabs, and for the reasons already explained—namely, their great prolificness from the remotest times, and the marked difference that existed between them even in those ages—we are quite unable to accept the idea of their derivation from one source. Before recording our impressions on this subject definitely, however, it would be only right to examine the other theories which have been hazarded on the subject, some of which at least have been supported with great ingenuity and learning.

The Bible theory has been already referred to, and is well known. The theory started by Sir William Jones was that the world was peopled by three primitive races—namely, the Indian, the Arabian, and the Tartarian—all of which sprang from one original stem, understood to be that of Noah; that the primal home of the Indian race was not India but Irán, from which one branch diverged eastward to India, while another branch went westward to Persia; that the eastern branch, after peopling all India, emigrated on one side through the passes of Assam into China, and on the other from the mouths of the Indus, as pirates, to Ethiopia and Egypt—the hordes which settled in Egypt also peopling in time, first Phœnicia, and afterwards Greece and Rome; and that from the other branch which went to Persia were descended the Persians, Assyrians, Jews, Armenians, and most of the remaining tribes of Asia Minor. The Tartars by this account peopled no other country in Asia but their own; and the Arabians also remained confined within the limits of their peninsula without expansion. The whole of this theory is well supported by the great similitude shown to have existed between the manners,

customs, languages, religions, and objects of worship of the peoples said to have originated from one race, and the extraordinary resemblance of some proper names promiscuously used in India, Egypt, and Greece.

In later days another theory has been advanced, which apparently carries with it an air of still greater probability. According to this, the great central place of the human race is Tartary, the people of which have been known in all ages to multiply enormously, to lead a thoroughly nomad life, and to wander about in hordes from one fruitful spot to another, ready on the slightest pressure from within, to pass out in any direction for conquest or plunder. It is supposed that swarms from this prolific hive conquered and settled in succession in Persia, India, and China, in ancient times, as they are known in modern times to have overrun all the countries of Europe. This hypothesis is so correct in appearance, that it could not but have received a very ready acceptance. The country of the Tartars is a large barren waste, surrounded on all sides except the north by territories extremely fertile and rich; and the inference has been seized upon with avidity, that, pinched by hunger in their own inhospitable land, they early inundated the adjoining untenanted places with all their superfluous population.

A third theory, which has found less favour, is, that each distinct country was peopled at the outset separately from within itself, and not by the immigration of families from other countries. In support of this hypothesis, it is pointed out that the fables of those countries which refer to the deluge, clearly indicate that more than one family—*i.e.*, at least one family in each country (*e.g.*, Noah or Xixuthrus in Assyria, Satyavratá in India, Orus in Egypt)—were saved; and that those countries in which the deluge did not occur, or was felt only in a partial degree, show by their own traditions that the planting of them commenced indigenously with the creation of the world. The traditions on this point are universal. We have the fables of the Dives and the Peris in some shape or other as inhabiting the world from the origin of

things. We have the names even of some of their kings (such as Gian-Ben-Gian, &c.), which have come down to us by the force of their fame. Shall we reject these altogether? If so, wherefore? Obscure the accounts are and must be; but they afford, nevertheless, a clearer clue to the solution of the problem before us than any other. From the creation to the deluge, the world had more than seventeen hundred years for its inhabitants to increase and multiply, and whether those inhabitants were Dives, or Peris, Deos or Asoors, giants, Genii, or Titans, their progeny must have fully sufficed to people their own native lands without any extraneous assistance; and if those lands were not at all, or not wholly, submerged by the deluge, there would be no necessity for any immigration from other countries to colonise them. As for the resemblance in names, and the similitude of manners, customs, and religion observable among some nations, which have been generally adduced as strong proofs of race-affinity and descent, these, it seems to us, are easily accounted for by the facilities of communication that existed in the earlier ages between the nations concerned; the resemblance in religion and in the objects of worship being also partly attributable to the fact that the worship of the elements and idols was general at the outset, which each nation had equal facilities to adopt for itself. We see what policy, commerce, and free communication have done in Europe in this respect in our day. The nations of the different states are, just at present, so intimately connected with each other, that they may well be regarded as one people. Why should we wonder, then, that the nations of the ancient world in some particulars resembled each other?

To us the last of the above theories appears to be the most sound. The first two are open to the general objection stated, that it does not appear to be credible that so many extensive and distant countries should from a given date—i.e., from the subsidence of the flood, or rather from the general dispersion of nations from Babel—have become so well peopled within a period of three or four centuries, as

they appear to have been from their own records, by one family which served as the procreating stem alike of the Tartars and the Iranians. It is not denied that there have been continual irruptions, raids, and conquering expeditions from one country into another; but that only accounts for the fusion of character and similitude of habits and customs on which so much stress has been laid to prove a race-affinity, without proving in the least the planting of one country by another within a brief specified period. When we read of the vast armies that Nínus, Semiramis, Stabrobates, and Sesostris are said to have led, and remember the nearness of their eras to the deluge by which the whole world was supposed to have been depopulated, we find ourselves in a manner compelled to scout the idea of any one country—even a prolific country like Tartary—being able to people not one, but many other countries equally large, so fully and so well. Ages would be necessary to produce such a result; the social state cannot be so expanded at once by galvanism or electricity.

Apart from this general objection, a retrospect of the history of each country will suggest many other adverse arguments peculiar to each, and at the same time explain the relative connection of those countries with one another, and how each was originated; particularizing the facilities of communication which existed between them, but which have now ceased to exist; defining the general ideas that prevailed in those ages in respect to ethics and religion, and the modes and observances of private life; and showing what opportunities existed for the adoption of those ideas by all, without one country being necessarily indebted for them to another. The whole subject affords abundant matter for reflection. There is no doubt whatever that the interior of Asia was better known in former times than it is at present; that the relations which subsisted between the different nations was more intimate in the past than we find it in our day; and that the old Hindus knew more of the Chinese, Persians, Egyptians, and Tartars, and *vice versâ*, than Great Britain, with all the appliances of modern civili-

sation, knows of Central Asia at this moment. A recapitulation of the main facts, traditional and historical, connected with each country will establish all this clearly. It will also enable us to determine with what advantages or disadvantages each country started at the outset; how civilisation was developed in each; to what extent it was actually developed; and how that civilisation came subsequently to dry up where it has done so. Our inquiry need not carry us into details of facts and figures. A very hurried glance at the salient points of history, such as throw light on the origin and establishment of each power, and on the arts and contrivances by which it was maintained, will give us all the information we require.

CHAPTER II.

CHINA.

THE native name of China is Chungkwo, or the middle kingdom. It is also called Tienchaon, or the Celestial Empire, as distinguished from the dominions belonging to outer barbarians. The name by which it was known to the ancient Tartars was Cathay. The whole country is divided into provinces, which again are subdivided into counties, shires, and cantons. It is plentifully watered by two of the most magnificent rivers in the world—the Hoang-Ho and the Yang-tzei-Kiang, by several minor streams, and by numerous canals, which intersect it in every direction. There are two considerable chains of mountains in it; but it nevertheless contains several large tracts which are complete plains. The climate varies greatly in different places, being altogether much colder than that of other countries lying within the same degrees of latitude. The diversities of soil, also, are great; but by far the largest portion of the country is very fertile. The products are manifold. Rice is everywhere cultivated, except in the north; a great many provinces produce tea; and sugar, silk, and grains of divers kinds are also among the principal staples. The whole country is extremely populous; and its inhabitants have for ages retained a name for great opulence, and for equally great love of peace. Marriages are contracted by them at an early age; and, while their wants are few, their industry renders every spot of ground productive.

The history of the country may be divided into four periods—viz.: (1) the Mythological Era; (2) the Ancient Period, as distinguished from what is purely mythological; (3) the Middle Ages; and (4) the Modern Period, with the last of which our present inquiry has no concern. The

mythological period commences with the creation of the world. The first of the Chinese emperors was Pwankoo, who, the account about him tells us, was born when the heaven and the earth, which had till then existed together, were separated. He and five of his immediate successors were chiefly employed in bringing together their subjects who were much scattered, and in discovering the best means of alleviating the inconveniences of life by building huts, preparing clothes out of the skins of animals and the bark of trees, producing fire by the friction of wood, and other similar schemes and contrivances. The next dynasty commenced with Fohi, who founded the Chinese empire, the nation having intermediately increased so much in number as to require an organized government. He instituted marriage, taught the people to make nets and rear and domesticate animals, and also to express their thoughts by hieroglyphic signs, and to divide their time into seasons. His successor, Shinnung, instructed them to cultivate the ground, established fairs, and invented the art of healing. But his days were much embittered by war, which now broke out in China for the first time, his opponent being a member of his own family named Hwangté, who eventually succeeded him. This prince turned out to be a sovereign of great ability, and was the first to introduce the art of writing. He was also the first to build a palace, to portion off his subjects and constitute villages and cities for them, and to invent arms, boats, carts, and chariots. A subsequent successor, Tekuh, established schools, and promoted virtue by the introduction of polygamy! The reigns of Yáou and Shun, who for some years ruled jointly, were especially distinguished for the wise laws and institutions they gave to the country, upon which the whole government of it was founded; and also for the moral and religious doctrines they laid down, which Confucius himself only professed to reproduce. In the reign of Yáou, the sun, it is said, did not set for ten days—a phenomenon probably of the same character as the alleged standing-still of that luminary at the command of Joshua. The greatest event in the

history of mankind—the universal deluge—also occurred in the time of Yáou; but it does not appear that all China was submerged by it. The Chinese records only mention that Yáou sent an officer named Káwn to the places which had suffered most to remedy the evil; and on his proving unsuccessful, he was replaced by his son Yu. We further read that Shun's attention was particularly directed to the draining of the drowned lands, and the confining of the rivers to their beds; that this proved a very difficult task, but was at last accomplished; and that the jungles and weeds, which rose up on the retirement of the waters, being burnt down, the country was rendered habitable. Shun died in B.C. 2208, or one hundred and forty-one years after the flood.

The ancient history of the country, as distinguished from the mythological period, begins with the reign of Yu, in B.C. 2205, which also commenced a new dynasty, called Heá, that ruled for four hundred and thirty-eight years. Yu was the only great prince of this line. He divided the empire into nine provinces, each of which was placed under a separate governor, selected all the subordinate officers of government himself, created facilities for bringing cases of oppression under inquiry, and combined in the emperor's person the duties of civil government with those of a high-priest. His successors were not men of parts, and the nation began to degenerate. The last prince of the dynasty, Keë-kwei, is set down as the worst that ever ruled in China.

The Heá dynasty was upset by that named Shang, which ruled for six hundred and forty-four years, commencing with B.C. 1766. The first prince was Chingtang, who defeated Keë-kwei, and obliged him to fly. He is said to have ruled well himself, and was assiduous in securing a good name by diminishing the taxes. The seventh emperor in succession, Taéwoo, was also a good and able sovereign, who prevented the mandarins from oppressing the people, and erected hospitals for the sick and almshouses for the aged; but the reigns of the intermediate princes were weak, and those of eight of his successors were so inglorious,

that the Chinese historians pronounce them to be undeserving of notice. During the reign of one of them, named Chung-ting (B.C. 1562 to 1548), the barbarians (Tartars apparently) commenced to make inroads into the empire, and were only repelled with great difficulty. The reign of Pwaukang was distinguished for the efforts he made to crush the insolence of the mandarins, which had already very much increased, and to free the people from their oppressions. One of his successors, Wooting, himself a weak prince, had a poor man, a mason, for his prime-minister, who, to some extent, restored the vigour of the empire, exacting tributes from the adjacent states. But there was no real vigour in the Shang dynasty; and it began to be daily more and more oppressive, which compelled many families of the people to emigrate to Japan and the neighbouring islands. The last emperor of this family was Chowsin, of whom it is said that he ripped up the belly of a woman to see the embryo in the womb, and tore out the heart of one of his ministers to read it aright. At last the nobles rose up against him, and defeated him; upon which Chowsin, like Saracus of Assyria, prepared a pile of wood and burnt himself to death.

The head of the rebellious nobles, Woowang, founded the Chow dynasty, which reigned for eight hundred and sixty-seven years, commencing from B.C. 1122. Personally, he was a man of great vigour; but his position as a usurper forced him to conciliate his brother-nobles by conferring on them lands and privileges, which in time introduced into the country all the evils of the fental system. A large number of petty, semi-independent governments started up in a short time, to wage perpetual war against each other, which there was no arm in the country strong enough to put down. Chingwang, the son of Woowang, was intrepid and wise, and he kept the semi-independent princes under some control; but his successors were men of no account. In the reign of Muhwang (B.C. 1001 to 947) the Tartars appeared on the frontier. This is the first mention made of them by name in the history of China; but it is more than probable that the "barbarians" who made inroads

in the reign of Chungting (B.C. 1562 to 1548) were also Tartars. Father Martini speaks of an even earlier invasion in the reign of Shun, or immediately after the deluge; but that rests on very doubtful authority.

The next batch of emperors was an exceedingly bad one. The Tartars attacked the frontiers repeatedly in the reign of Seuénwang (B.C. 827 to 782), and were only repulsed after sanguinary contests, all of which were fought by the people for their own protection, not by the king. By the reign of Pingwang (B.C. 770 to 720), these incursions became so frequent that the emperor, unable to protect the demesnes which were attacked, presented them to the prince of Tsin, one of the many powerful princes, or barons, who had started into existence by the arrangements sanctioned by Woowang, leaving that chief to take his own measures for defending the country. The other sovereigns of the Chow dynasty were weaker still, and the history of their reigns is entirely engrossed by the history of the semi-independent princes and their wars with each other, all fighting with an eye on the imperial throne. In the reign of Lingwang, in B.C. 552, was born Confucius (Kung-futszé), the greatest philosopher of China; and in the reign of Leëwang (B.C. 375 to 369) was born Mangtszé, who ranks next only to Confucius.

The Chow dynasty was overturned by the prince of Tsin, named Chaouséang; but the other princes, or barons, refused to acknowledge him as emperor, which title was therefore not assumed till every opposition was subdued by the grandson of Chaouséang, who ascended the throne under the name of Chwang-séang-wang, in B.C. 249. This new dynasty reigned for forty-three years. The second sovereign, Ché-Hwangté, was one of the most vigorous that China ever owned. He reconquered the whole country from the independent barons by force of arms; signalized himself by a successful excursion against the Huns, who, occupying the country immediately to the north of China, had commenced to give much trouble; and built the Great Wall all along the northern frontier, to keep out the bar-

barians. He at the same time made himself infamous by waging a war against literature and learned men; and many thousands of books were burnt by his orders, for which reason the Chinese historians never name him without abhorrence.

The vigour of the Tsin name died with Ché-Hwangté. The dynasty was overturned in B.C. 206 by Lewpang (afterwards named Kaoutsoo), the captain of a troop of robbers, who founded the Han dynasty, which reigned for four hundred and twenty-two years. It was in the time of this prince that the art of printing was discovered, apparently with a view to provide against such general destruction of books as Ché-Hwangté had effected. The third in succession was Leuhow, the first female that ever reigned over the Celestial Empire. Her talents were great, but she was a savage in ferocity, and her memory has been execrated by historians. Her successors were weak; and the Huns invading China repeatedly, had to be paid off by presents and blackmail. Not satisfied with bribes of this nature the barbarians demanded a tribute of maidens, and many females of the highest families had to be surrendered. In the time of Wooté (B.C. 140 to 88), another application of the same kind having been made, was rejected by him with disdain; and this was followed by a sudden attack on the Huns, by which the whole horde was routed. The Huns renewed the struggle repeatedly, but were defeated on every occasion; and Wooté having succeeded in sowing dissensions among the different sub-hordes of the tribe, which prevented them from becoming mischievous, they were only too glad to swear fealty to him and remain at peace. Wooté also distinguished himself as an encourager of learning; and the father of Chinese history, Izematseen, flourished during his reign. In the time of Seuenté (B.C. 73 to 49), the Huns and other Tartar tribes up to the borders of the Caspian, tired of fruitless struggles amongst themselves, submitted with one accord to the emperor, so that nominally the whole of Tartary, to the extent indicated, appertained at this time to the Chinese Empire.

The reign of Kwangwooté (A.D. 25 to 57) succeeded a period of great anarchy and confusion, the result of the continual wars carried on between the leaders of the different factions in the empire, during which the Tartars were enabled to reassert their independence, and resume their hostility. But the new emperor was vigorous, and besides making himself feared by all the contending parties at home, was able to gain several advantages over the barbarians by reviving the old policy of dividing their strength against each other, the object and inevitable consequence of which they were yet too thick-headed to foresee. In the reign of Mingté (A.D. 58 to 75), a deputation of mandarins visited India, and brought back with them the religion of Buddha. Both in this reign and the next the Tartars again became troublesome, till they were beat back with great slaughter. In the reign of Changté (A.D. 76 to 88) lived the greatest of Chinese female authors, Panhwuy-pan. The subsequent reigns to the end of the Han dynasty may be skipped over. They simply furnish us with a history of civil wars of great fury waged between the three kingdoms of Wei, Woo, and Shuh, for supremacy. The Tartars in the meantime were pressing continually on the frontiers, though fortunately the boldest of the tribes, the Huns, had already turned the whole of their strength towards the west, and were cutting out their way on to Europe, through the Alani and the Ostrogoths.

The character of the Chinese nation was formed principally during the reigns of the Chow and Han dynasties. The Han period especially was signalized by the revival of learning, which had suffered considerably from the anarchy and misrule of previous ages, and particularly from the barbarous hostility of Ché-Hwangté. Such fragments of ancient literature as still survived, were now carefully collected and restored, the characters were improved and fixed, and the future preservation of books was secured by the useful inventions of paper, ink, and the art of printing. The empire was at the same time well consolidated. The original seat of the Chinese nation was the province of

Shensé, situated in the north-west corner of China. The other northern provinces had been afterwards acquired and added to it gradually; while its southern provinces were for a long time peopled by savages, supposed to be of Indian origin. The Han dynasty consolidated the whole of this empire, and gave it the form and extent which it ever afterwards retained.

The middle ages of Chinese history commence with the rule of the second Tsin dynasty, which began in A.D. 264, and continued for one hundred and fifty-six years. The states of Woo and Shuh had both become enfeebled by continual wars; while Wei, which still remained unshaken, was seized by Szemayen, the prince of Tsin, who ascended the imperial throne under the name of Wooté (the second). But neither he, nor his immediate successors, proved to be equal to the times, which were exceedingly troublesome. A new branch of the Tsin family occupied the throne with the ascent of Yuenté, in A.D. 317, but did not prove any stronger than that which had preceded it. The period was one of wars and bloodshed; the principality of Chaou was in rebellion against the imperial power, and was supported by the Tartars; as soon as this state was put down, that of Yeu rose up in arms: and this chronic state of disaffection continued to the end of the chapter, till the throne was abdicated by Kungté, in A.D. 420, and passed to the Sung dynasty.

The first Sung prince was Lewyu, who adopted the name of Kaoutsoo, which means "grand exalted sire," apparently a favourite name with the emperors, as several others assumed it, both before and after him. The new king was a bold man and highly gifted, but one whose hands were imbrued with the blood of many members of the last royal family, and whose party, therefore, was not strong. He did not possess the whole empire, the northern portion of it being held entirely by the princes in revolt, who, supported by the Tartars, defied him and his successors to the end of the Suy dynasty. In the reign of Wanté (A.D. 424 to 453), many colleges and schools were founded and the

Chinese began to revive as a literary nation ; but the times were so wicked that the emperor was killed by one of his own sons. The last prince of the line, Shunté, was also assassinated.

Of the Tsé dynasty which followed, the first emperor, Séaou-taou-ching, proved to be an excellent sovereign. Léungwooté, of the Léang dynasty also, besides being a valiant soldier, was a good patron of learning, and especially of classical studies ; but he became very imbecile in latter life, and the country was always in unrest during his reign. Kaoutsoo, the head of the Chin dynasty, had his throne dyed in blood. Yangkeen, the head of the Suy dynasty (who also assumed the name of Kaoutsoo), was a sovereign of better parts, and succeeded in uniting once more the northern and southern portions of the empire, by bribing the Tartar chief, who had hitherto supported the former in revolt, with the hand of an imperial princess. Shortly after, in A.D. 619, during the time of the Tang dynasty, China came in contact with another barbarous nation, the Turks, who had originally worked under the Tartars at the foot of the Imaus, as slaves occupied in digging iron, but having since asserted their independence, were allured by the luxuries of China to the desire of settling in it. They were, however, easily bought off by bribes, on receiving which they directed their forces westward, where they established the Turkish dominions still extant.

But though the external enemies of the empire were thus disposed of, and their course diverted into other directions, there was no protection to it from its internal enemies, who gave it no repose. Civil wars and private quarrels had exhausted all the energies of the country, and brought it to the brink of ruin ; the affairs of government were controlled entirely by the eunuchs of the palace ; the emperors were mere puppets selected for their well-known imbecility ; the history of the period is only a record of incapacity and crime. One of the princes, Chaoutsung, was at last obliged to call in the aid of a body of robbers to extricate him from the toils in which he found himself entangled.

The result was that the eunuchs were destroyed, but the dynasty became no stronger.

The five dynasties called the Wootaeé reigned fifty-two years, their history being only one of petty wars. In the reign of Chuhté (A.D. 943 to 946), the Tartars again invaded China with a large army, and proclaimed an emperor of their own choice; but the prince thus selected did not venture to accept the diadem, and was content to transfer it to another, a soldier of fortune named Lecheyuen, who, after driving back the Tartars, assumed the throne under the well-prized name of Kaoutsoo. The second Sung dynasty which followed reigned for three hundred and nineteen years, commencing from A.D. 960; and the first prince, Chaoukwang-yin, did much to resubjugate the disaffected states. But what now pressed most upon the empire was the frequent incursion of the Tartars (the Kin Tartars, as they called themselves), who had already become possessed of Léaoutung, and now invaded the provinces of Péchelé and Shensé. To drive them out the Emperor Ningtsung invited the assistance of the Mogul Tartars, who accomplished what was wanted of them, but kept all their conquests to themselves, which laid the foundation of the Yuen or Mogul dynasty, by which the Sung dynasty was eventually overthrown.

The connection of China with the barbarians commenced, we have seen, in the sixteenth century before Christ, after which their inroads into it continued to be repeated off and on, being occasionally repelled by force, but oftener bought off with a bribe. The Huns, who dwelt to the north of the country, were apparently its first invaders. In the time of Ché-Hwangté the Great Wall was built to keep them off; but this was too weak a protection for an unwarlike people against raiders so poor, so warlike, so impetuous as the Tartars. The consequence was, that China was obliged to pay a large price for that safety which her arms could not secure, and paid it from very early times, not only in gold, silver, and silks, but also in women. The Tartars were an ugly race; their own women they despised and reserved for

domestic labours; a supply of women for their beds was the customary tribute they exacted from the better-featured nations they conquered, and a poem of some merit is still extant in which a Chinese princess is made to bewail her hard lot in being compelled to live in the tent of a barbarian, receiving only raw flesh for food and sour milk for drink. Wooté, of the Han dynasty, was the first to refuse this tribute; and his arms and his policy were both vigorously employed in backing his refusal with effect. But the demand was apparently revived and acceded to after his time; and this accounts both for the constant attacks made on China by the barbarians, and their as frequent peaceful retirements from it.

The first of these raiders, the Huns, at last directed their attention, as we have seen, to other conquests in the west; but the tribes who replaced them were only too eager to follow their example, and the weakness and intestine discord that prevailed in China throughout the reign of the second Tsin dynasty, gave them a footing in it even firmer than what the Huns had been able to secure. For above one hundred and sixty years they virtually ruled over all the northern provinces, taking part with those who were in revolt, with whom they fraternized and intermarried, and among whom they appear to have been finally dissolved. The third race of invaders were the Turks, who gave no trouble, but went westward like the Huns on being bought off. The fourth were the Moguls, to whom we have last alluded. The Huns and the Turks expanded westwards, and thus relieved China of her fears from them. The Moguls were especially organized by the celebrated Chingez Khán to dilate in all directions, and did so,—Bátou Khán spreading desolation into Poland and Germany on the west, Haláku overrunning Persia, Palestine, and Armenia on the south, Sheibáni penetrating into the frozen regions of Siberia, and Kublai Khán, the greatest of them all, taking possession of the flowery land. The ancestors of Chingez Khán had been tributaries to the Chinese emperors in respect to the lands which they held in China after driving

out the Kin Tartars; even Chingez himself held a title of honour and servitude. But this did not prevent him from leading two distinct expeditions against the empire, the first of which was bought off by the surrender of an imperial princess and five hundred other maidens, and in the second of which he annexed the five northern provinces to his dominions. Those provinces were more effectually subdued seven years after by Octai Khán, the successor of Chingez, the latter having with his dying breath exhorted his children to complete his conquests; and, a few years later, the whole of China was taken by Kublai Khán, the magnificence of whose court has been recorded in the wondrous tale of the travels of Marco Polo. The seat of empire was removed by Kublai from Nanking to Peking, or Khánbálík, as it was called by the Moguls, and Polo, as a foreigner, was employed by him in several missions of high trust in the interior of the empire. The dominion of Kublai was very extensive—more extensive than the British or Russian Empire of the present day, as it stretched from the Pacific Ocean to the Dneiper, and from the Frozen Sea to the Straits of Malacca. It is said that the conquered races submitted to him with willingness, because he was exceedingly humane in his treatment of them and relieved their wants with the most liberal hand. In the midst of this greatness, however, the mutinous spirit of his own countrymen caused him the greatest anxiety; and this foretold the early fall of the Mogul dynasty. Nevertheless, all the Mogul princes who sat on the throne of China, short as their tenure of office was, governed well—much better than the indigenous emperors who had immediately preceded them. Kublai restored the old Chinese constitution; and he, as well as all his successors, submitted to the laws, the fashions, and even the prejudices of their subjects, to please them. They also restored letters, commerce, and justice; improved the face of the country by the excavation of canals; and did all they could to promote peace and tranquillity. Unfortunately, in a short time, they themselves were enervated by luxury—which is always fatal except to an indus-

trious people. From living in tents, in the old fashion of their own country, they began to live in houses, hemmed in by all the indolent pleasures of a Chinese existence; and, becoming educated in the manners of China, they soon succumbed to them. Even the disciplined army which they had brought with them was soon dissolved in a vast and populous country teeming with sensuality and crime; and the government of the Emperor Tohwan-témur was easily overthrown, in A.D. 1368, by Chooyuen-chang, the son of a poor labourer, who introduced the Ming dynasty. The first foreign yoke imposed on the Chinese was, within a period of ninety years, thus overturned. The Ming dynasty then ruled with vigour for a period of two hundred and seventy-six years, and the country flourished considerably under its sway. But it also was overthrown in its turn, in A.D. 1644, the conquerors this time being, not the Moguls, but the Mántchoo Tartars of the Tungoosian race, who were assisted by the Moguls.

We have brought down the history of China to a later date than we intended, merely to notice the two conquests of it by the Moguls and the Mántchoo Tartars, the only foreign races that ever established themselves over the whole country. In reviewing the facts we have stated, we find no account anywhere of any descendant of Noah having proceeded to China to people it. We do not lose sight of the two assumptions frequently advanced, that China was probably planted by the Tartars descending to it from the steeps of the Imaus, or by the Kshetriyas on their being expelled from India; both assumptions being based on the supposition that the Hindus and the Tartars derive their descent from the stock of Noah, which in itself is erroneous. Even apart from that objection, neither of the hypotheses seems to us to have any good foundation to stand upon. The Tartar invasion assumed by Father Martini, were it possible to corroborate it by better evidence than has yet been advanced in its support, would still prove nothing as respects the first, simply by proving too much; for, if the invasion alluded to took place in the reign of Shun, its date

was necessarily much too early for any branch of the family of Noah to have anteriorly peopled Tartary, and then extended thence to China. We do not believe in any such invasion, for the simple reason that the Tartars do not seem to have developed themselves sufficiently at the time for such a purpose. We believe that both China and Tartary had then already ceased to be thinly peopled—for we are not wedded to the dogma of all races of men being descended from Noah, to commence with; but we doubt greatly if either was yet strong enough to send out emigrants or raiders in any direction. In the Tartar accounts we read that Oghuz Khán was the first who made himself master of Cathay; and, if we take his era approximately at between B.C. 1800 and 1600, it brings us very near to the time when the Tartars began to be troublesome on the borders of China, in the reign of Chungting (B.C. 1562 to 1548). But the Chinese accounts show that, on that occasion, the Tartars were repulsed; and even if it had been otherwise, the era for planting China had then gone by.

The other hypothesis is also open to the same objection of an unaccordance of dates. The descent of the Chinese from the Kshetriyas has been supported by a text of Menu, which says, that “many families of the military class, having gradually abandoned the ordinances of the *Veds*, . . . lived in a state of degradation, such as the people of Pandraka and Adra, those of Drávira and Camboja, the Yavanas and Sákás, the Paradas and Pahlavas, the *Chinas*, and other nations;” and Sir William Jones, referring to the story of Yayati, an Indian prince of the Lunar race, having banished his son Druhya to the eastward of India with a curse that his progeny would be ignorant of the *Veds*, says that this Druhya was probably identical with Fohi, who is generally recognised as the progenitor of the Chinese. In refutation of this supposition, it will perhaps be sufficient to point out that, by the Chinese accounts, Fohi lived long before the deluge, which did not occur till the reign of Yáou, while Druhya, by the Hindu accounts, lived some

generations after Satyavratá, the Noah of the Hindus. It may be further mentioned that the Chinese accounts distinctly make Fohi a native of China, born in the province of Shensé, in the north-west corner of the empire. His birth was, of course, miraculous; he was too great a man to be allowed to have an ordinary birth, and the story mentions that his mother was embraced by a rainbow: but that rainbow, mind, had no connection with the rainbow of the deluge, for the simple fact already stated, that Fohi belonged to an anterior age.

Rejecting both the above assumptions, then, we may take it for granted that China was not peopled by any descendant of Noah: in fact, all her stories go to prove that China was well peopled before the flood; that the flood, when it did come, did not destroy all her inhabitants; that all the damage it did to the country was repaired after the labour of a few years. It follows, therefore, that China was planted in regular course by an independent set of first parents, especially given to the country from the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth—*i.e.*, that the Chinese are an aboriginal race occupying their own country from the first dawn of time: a conclusion fully borne out by the history of their civilisation, and even by their outward appearance. They have mixed long, very long, with the Moguls and the Tartars; it is with them only that they have intermarried: but the features of the Chinaman are still easily distinguishable from those of the Mogul and the Tartar, and with those of the Hindu they have no affinity whatever.

We do not know whether it is necessary to notice here the doubts which have been expressed by some writers in respect to the real antiquity of China and the amount of civilisation that did prevail in it. Such doubts are always forthcoming whenever there is an ugly stumbling-block in our chapter of beliefs which there is no facile way of getting over. In the case of China, however, they are not supported by reasoning or argument of any kind, and are therefore very easily answered. The only objection that has ever

been taken to the antiquity of the country is, that the ancient Greek and Roman authors do not speak of it—that it was barely known to them by name. But this is rather a proof of the ignorance of the Greek and Roman authors in respect to the general geography and history of the world, than one of the non-existence of the Chinese as a nation in their day, when in fact many of the manufactures of China, especially in silk, were then finding their way daily into Europe. These were, indeed, immediately delivered to the Greeks and Romans by Persian merchants; but the source from whence they came might have been easily traced if the Greeks and Romans had cared to know anything about the matter. On the other hand, the proofs establishing the remote antiquity of the Chinese exist in their own records, which have not been found to be untrustworthy; in the corroborative testimony of such equally ancient records of the Hindus as exist (*e.g.*, the passage from Menu which has been already cited); and in the existence among the Chinese, to this day, of such arts as picture-writing and hieroglyphic-painting, which generally indicate an old existence, and which were only equally well-known, one to the ancient Mexicans, and the other to the ancient Egyptians, from neither of whom could they have been borrowed.

In respect to the extent of Chinese civilisation, if it was not very great in the abstract, it cannot be said to have been very inconsiderable, when we remember that, such as it was, it was almost entirely of indigenous growth. By her position China has always been, what she is at this moment, more or less cut off from the rest of the world; and yet was the country always provided with everything that could possibly be required for ministering to the wants and comforts of man. Literature and philosophy were early cultivated by its inhabitants; theology and ethics also; nay, even astronomy, music, and magic!—and all this without neglecting agriculture, medicine, navigation, commerce, and the mechanical arts. Step by step, and one step at a time, was the golden rule they followed,

as is shown by the facts which their historians have taken so much care to record; and the success achieved was certainly not inconsiderable. The efforts of the first two dynasties were mainly confined to the clearance of the country, the formation of villages, and the introduction among the people of agriculture and the pastoral and domestic arts. Suju, who immediately preceded Fohi, is said to have invented knotted cords, as the first crude attempt of his age for recording ideas; Fohi invented symbols, and substituted them for the knotted cords; Hwangté reduced the symbols to characters, which were afterwards improved in the reign of Lewpang. Throughout the reigns of Fohi, Shinnung, and Hwangté, the growth and progress of the sciences and arts were especially fostered. Then followed the age for laws, regulations, and political institutions, under Yáou and Shun—Yáou being the first legislator, while Shun gave effect to those of his predecessor's ideas which he did not live to carry out. Of Hwangté it is said that he cut through mountains to facilitate commerce; that he discovered the mariner's compass; and that one of his ministers, Yongcheng, discovered the polar star,—and all this, be it remembered, before the deluge, which found the rest of the world plunged generally in barbarism and crime. In after-years, many of the emperors are described as having been good astronomers themselves, and as taking great personal interest in teaching astronomy to their subjects. A tribunal of history existed to compose accurate accounts of each reign, the first portion of whose labours was published, in B.C. 97, by Izematseen, in the reign of Wooté; and, if all these annals be not altogether trustworthy, surely no other Asiatic country ever made such effort to arrive at the truth. The very assortment of the classics of the nation attests to a considerable progress in letters among them. The divisions were five,—namely, (1) Shúking, which was historical; (2) Shíking, which was poetical; (3) Yíking, which probably referred to sciences, but is now little understood; (4) Chung Cieu, which related to government; and (5) Líkí, which

had reference to moral duties. Of the perseverance of the people, a standing proof exists in the Great Wall of China, carried over mountains and across rivers for more than one thousand miles, its height varying from fifteen to thirty feet, whilst its breadth affords space enough for six horsemen to ride abreast upon it. Of their general aptness, almost every manufacture of China affords ample evidence, being nearly as good as the similar productions of Europe. The manufacture of gunpowder is said to have been known to the Chinese long before it was discovered in the West; it is certain that the art of printing was known to them at least two hundred years before the birth of Christ, and the manufacture of paper from an earlier date; and, more wonderful still, they knew the use of the mariner's compass from the time of Hwangté, which must have been of inestimable benefit to them in their rude excursions on the ocean, carried on in square-built ships, made of pieces of wood sewed together with the strong thread of the coconut, which were mainly directed to different ports by the flight of birds and by periodical winds. In these excursions the Indian ports were particularly sought for; and it is well known that at Ceylon the Chinese trader met the Persian capitalist half-way to dispose of his silks—a proof in itself of very considerable progress for the age.

If it be asked when all this civilisation ceased to exist, and how, the answer is that it has never ceased to exist. It suffered considerably during the several ages of anarchy and misrule which we have noticed, but was always revived as soon as better times came back. China still is what she was before. Excluding the European Powers, Russia and Great Britain, she is yet the most powerful kingdom of Asia, her people the most ingenious, the most advanced—Japan being only an offshoot of the Chinese stem. But her civilisation, such as it is, has been stationary for ages. Her government has made it so, not knowing that when nations cease to advance they begin to fall back; and, in the competition with European Powers, her future career

must be retrograde, though as yet she has retained her position with wonderful tenacity.

The government of China was monarchical from the earliest times, and is so now, the king being vested with absolute authority. He is not only all-powerful, but, like the Pope, infallible also. There are laws laid down for his guidance, and advisers placed over him whose admonitions he is bound to consider; but it rests entirely with him to determine whether he should or should not abide by either. Some of the laws enacted are excellent; they were framed by the good kings we have named—Yáou, Shun, and others—and endorsed by philosophers like Confucius and Mangtszé: but it depends on the character of the sovereign and his advisers to observe them, or set them aside; and when the emperors are inefficient and weak, the laws simply enforce a well-organized system of oppression, from which there is no protection but in revolt. We have seen, in the brief retrospect of history we have given, that this protection was often sought, not by the people, but by the mandarins, whose rebellious temper is noticeable from the early time of Taéwoo of the Heá dynasty, and who always raised their heads whenever the emperors were weak. These contentions debilitated the empire considerably, particularly as the barbarians were ever at hand to take advantage of every internal dissension; but the more vigorous emperors, such as Ché-Hwangté, Wooté, and Suenté, were always able to re-enforce their power with a rod of iron—certainly over their internal foes, if not over their external enemies also.

With so much executive and political authority in his hands, the Emperor of China is also the head of the national Church, and he has a board of rites under him to enforce the observance of the national faith. Notwithstanding this, however, the Chinese, as a rule, have always been remarkable for their indifference to religion. The orthodox creed of the State is that enjoined by Confucius, which is considered to be the religion of scholars, and which is very like the religion of the Hindu *Veds*, inculcating the worship

of heaven and earth, and of the spirits of rain, air, and fire. It is said that there was a prior religion, which consisted simply of the belief in one God, called Tyen. If so, the religion of China would still resemble that of India as propounded in the Upanishads. But it would be absurd to twist this religious affinity into a proof of Indian descent, since the notions common to both are only of a general character, which both countries had equal facilities to adopt without any reference to each other; besides which, there always existed ample opportunities of borrowing such notions from each other from the remotest times. Another creed largely followed throughout China is that of Laoutszé, which, like the Pouranic religion of India, sanctions the grossest idolatry. But the religion most extensively prevalent is that of Buddha, which was imported from India in A.D. 65.

CHAPTER III.

INDIA.

INDIA is known to its inhabitants by the name of Bhárat-barsha, or the land of Bhárat, who was one of its ancient rulers. The country has been well-known in all ages as one of the richest in the world. It is bounded on the north, and, as it were, cut off from the rest of Asia, by the Himálayá Mountains, while three other ranges of mountains traverse the peninsula within. It contains also some of the largest and most celebrated rivers, such as the Ganges, the Indus, the Mahánadi, and the Nermuddá, which maintain an amazing degree of fertility throughout the land, that suffices not only to satisfy the wants of its own people, but also to supply the rest of the world with some of the most valuable necessities of life. The number of harvests in the year is usually two, and the principal products are rice, sugar, cotton, jute, silk, indigo, tobacco, and saltpetre. Even the mountains of the country are covered with trees that bear a great variety of fruits, and the woods are stocked with game. The climate is one of the hottest in the world, and in several places exceedingly malarious; and the wild beasts multiply in the jungles with the most astounding rapidity. No country in the world is infested by tigers and alligators of larger size, or by serpents of deadlier poison. The lowlands of the country are subject to destructive inundations, while the sea-coasts are often visited by tremendous hurricanes.

Of this country, so variously endowed by Providence, there are no ancient annals or historical accounts of any description. The literature of India is very prolific. Besides the *Veds* and the *Puráns*, which form the basis of the philosophical and popular religions of the country, there

are a great many other learned works on theology and philosophy, many intricate treatises on grammar, two great poems of the highest standard of merit, with several others of scarcely inferior excellence, many treatises on law, a few learned works on astronomy, some very erudite productions on necromancy and incantations, but absolutely no historical composition whatever. Our only source of information, therefore, till we come to the Mahomedan era, are the *Puráns*, which, with their legends about the gods, give also some royal genealogies, but without any historical data, or any attendant information, such as would enable us to convert the dry catalogue of names into a consistent account of facts. Some stray notices taken of the country by certain western writers in connection with the histories of Persia, Egypt, and Assyria, are also available; but they are too disjointed and fragmentary to be of much real use, and are, moreover, mixed up with the grossest absurdities and errors. The details that we can give of ancient India, therefore, will necessarily be of a desultory character, and for the most part either wholly fictitious, or partly traditional and partly fictitious, blended with such assumed probabilities and inferences as may occur to us.

To commence with the commencement, then, the antediluvian history of India gives us first the ten Brahmádicás, or children of Bruhmá, as the first-born of men. They were Marichi, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Puláhu, Critu, Daksha, Vasishta, Bhrigu, and Nárada. From these Brahmádicás sprang the Menus, by some said to have been fourteen in number, while others mention seven only, named Swayambhuva, Swarochisa, Uttama, Tamasa, Raivata, Chacshusha, and Satyavratá. Satyavratá lived in the age of the flood, and is taken for Noah; though it would, perhaps, be more correct to say that he was contemporaneous with Noah, and escaped the flood in a different part of the world. Besides the Brahmádicás there were also several Rishis sprung from Bruhmá, named Kasyápa, Atri, Vasishta, Viswámitra, Gautama, Jamadagni, and Bharadwaja. Two of the names of the Rishis correspond with two of the names of the

Brahmádicās—viz., those of Atri and Vasishta. It is therefore inferred that the Brahmádicās and the Rishis were the same persons, who were Brahmádicās, or sons of Bruhmá by birth, and Rishis, or penitents in old age, by choice.

The above account drops off altogether as an unnecessary excrescence of history, since the *Puráns* next tell us that Bruhmá soon became disappointed with the arrangements first made by him for filling the earth, probably because the Rishis did not increase and multiply as fast as they were intended and expected to do. He therefore gave two sons to Adimá (original mother) the wife of Swayambhuva, from one of whom was descended Aja, and from the other Prithu (after whom the world was called Prithibi), both being contemporaries of Satyavratá at the time of the flood. All these three persons were saved from a watery grave, and, after the subsidence of the waters, began to replant the earth. The partiality of the Hindus for triads being well known, some authorities contend that the three names belonged to one patriarch only, by whom India was repopled.

Regarding the flood itself there are several accounts, which, however, need not be noticed, as they mainly refer to such recondite subjects as the wars between the elephants and the crocodiles, the churning of the ocean, the fishing up of the moon from the bottom of the sea, the uplifting of the earth on the tusk of a boar, and the like. After the flood we start with two lines of kings—namely, the line of Satyavratá, the race of the Sun, and that of Atri, the race of the Moon; so that Atri, or some of his descendants, must also have escaped destruction. Of the first line, the princes of note were Sharma (said to be the same with Shem—that is, if we accept Satyavratá to be the same with Noah), Ikshwáku, Mándhátá, Ságara, Bhagirath, Rughu, Dasarath, and Ráma. Of the line of Atri were Soma, Boodh or Buddha, Áya, Náhusa, and Yayati. Yayati had three sons, some say five, of whom two were famous—namely, Puru and Jadu. Of the former were descended

Bhárat (after whom India is named), Hasti, Kuru, Pándu, and the Pándavas; and these and their progeny seem to have filled up the most part of India. From the main branch of Kuru were born Pándu and Dhritaráshtra, whose children fought the great battle of Kuru-kshetra, to settle the right of succession between themselves. The most renowned descendants of Jadu were Krishna and Balarám. A branch of the Puru line, diverging from Kuru, gave birth to the kings of Magadha—namely, Jarásandhá and his successors, the dynasty terminating with Ripoonjaya, in the seventh century before Christ; after which followed several families of usurpers, including Nanda and his son Chandragupta, which brings the account down to B.C. 300. But it must be remembered that the history of Magadha is not the history of all India, though it has been assumed to be so to avoid the difficulties which surround the subject. We have absolutely no account of the other kingdoms where the Purus and Jadus had reigned; and the information available in regard to the children of the Sun generally is equally obscure. It is found convenient to form a connecting link by asserting that the kings of Magadha were in their days the lords-paramount of all India, which, of course, renders it unnecessary to account for the rest. But this they were not; certainly not till the time of Chandragupta, if even then. Megasthenes, who resided at the court of Chandragupta, says that there were one hundred and eighteen nations in India at the time; but he does not say that all or many of them were subordinate to the Práchi.

We have seen that the royal race of India divided itself into two branches immediately after the days of Satyavratá: one, the Solar line, comprising the male descendants of the patriarch; and the other, the Lunar line, sprung from the marriage of Ila, the daughter of Satyavratá, with Buddha, the grandson of Atri. The capital of the former was Ayodhya, or Oude; of the latter Prayága, or Alláhábád. These places were so near each other, and took up such an inconsiderable portion of the peninsula, that the inference

is unavoidable that they did not represent all the sovereign authority established in the land. There must have been many other states besides, of which no records have survived—if not immediately after the flood, certainly within a reasonable interval. We would also notice that in the above accounts the name of the son of Satyavratá is given as Sharma (Shem), but that other accounts name him Jayapati (Japheth); the object of both versions being to make the Indian and Mosaic accounts accord, though, as a matter of fact, there is not much of accordance between them.

The Solar line counts fifty-seven princes from Ikshwáku to Ráma; but of most of them we know very little beyond their names, or accounts are given too outrageous for belief. Thus Ságara is said to have had a hundred (some accounts make it sixty thousand) sons, all of whom were destroyed by flames exhaled in anger from the eyes of Kapila, the sage, but who were afterwards restored to life by the advent of the Ganges, brought down from heaven by the prayers of Bhagirath. It is useless referring to such legends, of which the hidden meaning (whatever it was) is not accessible to us. The *Rámáyana* gives a more consistent account of Dasarath and Ráma, the story regarding whom is well-known, and will not require to be retold, though there are some attendant circumstances connected with it which may be noted. Ráma married the daughter of Janaka, king of Mithila, also of the Solar line, which shows that there were two branches of the race at least within a short distance of each other. A third branch had its head-quarters at Benáres; and possibly there were others elsewhere, of which we know nothing. It is pretty clear from all this that the race was already splitting up. It is also said that many independent sovereigns were present in Oude at the Aswamedh Jagya celebrated by Dasarath; the army with which Ráma went to Ceylon was, we likewise find, made up of quotas furnished by several absolute princes who accepted the lead of Ráma only for the nonce: so that, at this time at least, and in fact at all

times, the constitution of India resembled more that of Greece than of any other olden country, and was simply the confederation of a large number of distinct states. The *Bhārat Khund* divides the empire of India into ten parts—namely: (1) Seraswati, which comprised the Punjāb; (2) Kanouj, which included Delhi, Ágrá, Sirinugur, and Oude; (3) Mithila, which comprehended all the territory from the Koosi to the Gunduck; (4) Gour, or the lower part of Bengal; (5) Goozára, which comprised Guzerát, Kandeish, and Málwá; (6) Utkala, or Orissá; (7) Mahárástra, or the Mahrattá country; (8) Telingáná, or the territory lying between the Godávery and the Krishná; (9) Karnáta, or the country south of the Krishná and above the Gháts; and (10) Drávira, or the Támil country. This division is palpably incomplete, since it leaves out such important portions as Prayága and Magadha; but what we want to point out is that, with the clear proofs we have of the existence of such marked divisions, it is not correct to name any particular king as the king of all India, or of any very large portion of it.

While fifty-seven princes of the Solar line are named from Ikshwáku to Ráma, only forty-eight princes of the Lunar race are mentioned from the founder of the dynasty to the era of the Pándavas; so that, considering that the age of the *Mahábhārat* was somewhat later than that of the *Rámáyana*, the reigns of the Lunar sovereigns must, as a general rule, have been longer than those of the Solar sovereigns, unless it be that several names of the former have been lost. Of the Puru family, the only detailed accounts available are those given in the *Mahábhārat* relating to Pándu and the Pándavas, the heroes of the great war of Kuru-kshetra, and those known in respect to Jarásandhá and his successors, who established a different branch at Magadha. The story of the *Mahábhārat* does not require to be repeated, any more than that of the *Rámáyana*. It affords further proof, if more proof were needed, that India, from the earliest times, was parcelled off into a number of petty states, which was in all ages the

great source of her weakness, and but for which she might have easily become a most potent and formidable empire. After the great war, Parikshit, the grandson of Arjun, was placed on the throne of Hastinápore, or rather of Indraprastha, that being the name of the new city founded by Yudisthira; but there is no further mention of this branch of the family beyond the enumeration of a string of names, and we know little of the subsequent history of the race.

The royal house of Magadha was established by Jarásandhá, who had been appointed governor of that province by a sovereign of the Lunar race a few decades before the great war; while another account makes Magadha contemporaneous with Ayodhyá, and states that the ancestors of Jarásandhá reigned in it from the time of Vrihadrátha, after whom the dynasty was named. Old Sandhá, at all events, was the most conspicuous prince of the line. He distinguished himself by a war with Krishna, who had dethroned and slain his son-in-law, Kangsa, king of Mathoorá, and who was obliged in his turn to fly to the sea-coast, where he founded Dwárká. A few years later the fame of the Pándavas excited the jealousy of Jarásandhá; and, as both parties aspired to the sovereignty of India, the opportunity was afforded to Krishna to enlist the antipathy of the Pándavas against his old enemy. Jarásandhá thus came to be attacked in his own capital simultaneously by Bheem, Arjun, and Krishna, by the first of whom he was slain; but twenty-three princes of his line continued to reign in Magadha after him, till the last of them, Ripoonjaya, was murdered by his minister, Sunaka, who placed his own son, Prádyota, on the throne. A catalogue of names is given to us, both as regards the Vrihadráthas and the dynasties that followed, but no details till we come to the time of Nanda, or Mahánanda, (B.C. 355), when Alexander the Great invaded India.

We must now go back to our other authorities, the western writers, for an account of the many expeditions against India to which they refer. The first in point of

time, leaving out the travelling expedition of Osiris, king of Egypt, was the invasion of Semiramis, queen of Babylon, which is said to have been opposed by one Stabrobates, who was then king of all India. This Stabrobates appears to have been the same as Virasena, otherwise called Sthábarpati, in the Hindu accounts ; and Ctesias mentions that Semiramis was defeated by him, and that he assembled against her an army of about four millions of men. The next expedition was conducted by Sesostris, king of Egypt, who is said to have overrun all India up to the Ganges. The third invader named was Shishak, or Bacchus, another king of Egypt, who, being very powerful at sea, advanced first to the mouths of the Indus and conquered all the country about that river, and then, doubling Cape Comorin, arrived near the mouths of the Ganges, which seem to have been the extreme limit of his naval expedition. Some authors confound Shishak with Sesostris ; others maintain that the two invaders were distinct. They all pretend that Shishak not only conquered the whole of India, but placed a king of his own appointment, one Spartembas, on the throne, whose successors retained it till the invasion of India by Hercules, whenever that may have occurred, the name of Hercules having been severally identified with Hari (Krishna), Balarám, and Jarásandhá. Before the arrival of Shishak, the people of India are said to have led a pastoral life, being strangers to agriculture and the use of arms ; but this could not well have been so if they gave Semiramis the warm reception she is said to have received. Shishak is also said to have introduced among the Hindus the worship of the gods ; and this has sufficed to embolden some of our orientalists to identify him with Sákya Muni, the great propagator of Buddhism in India.

Both previous to this time and after it, some Scythic or Tartar invasions of India are said to have occurred, of which no precise dates can be given. Wilford, in one of his essays in the *Asiatic Researches*, refers to an attack in B.C. 2000, when Rájáh Báhu, the king, was defeated, till his son, Ságara, came out with his *agni-astam*, or firearms,

and repelled the barbarians. The Mogul chief, Oghuz Khán, whose era we have approximately taken at between B.C. 1800 to 1600, is also said to have invaded India and occupied Cashmere. He had three sons, named Kiun, or the Sun, Áy, or the Moon, and Juldus, or the Star; and, we read, that the empire of the Moguls in Tartary was shortly after their time subverted by the Tartars, on which the descendants of the Sun, Moon, and Star were obliged to disperse. The irruptions into India are said to have continued all through this eventful period. Does this throw any light on the origin of the Solar and Lunar races in India? We wish to assume nothing; our assumption would scarcely have any argument to support it but a bare coincidence of names; even the dates do not precisely accord, for the Solar and Lunar races in India commenced apparently from an earlier time than even that of Oghuz Khán. But where all is dark, and we have to feel our way through the difficulties that surround us, no apology is necessary to ventilate such problems as arise in the course of our inquiry. Regarding the subsequent Scythic invasions, also, everything is vague and hypothetical. The Takshak, or Serpent, race is said to have visited India at about the same time that the north of Europe was overrun by other swarms from the same hive; and the history of Magadha does show that a usurper named Sheshanága, or Shesha the Serpent, established himself on the throne of that kingdom in B.C. 777, from whom Mahánanda and Chandragupta were descended. But the evidence to support the connection of Sheshanága with the Takshak race, or with any race of Scythians, is purely chimerical; and it is impossible to found any conclusion one way or another on such assumption.

All, then, that can be admitted comes only to this, that from the remotest times India has been exposed to aggressions from almost all quarters—Egyptian, Assyrian, Tartarian, and Persian; and, if we admit the evidence of the Persian records, it must be further conceded that, subsequent to the days of greatest antiquity, India was

probably never absolutely independent. The Persian annals speak of an invasion of the country by Cyrus, who does not appear, however, to have made any considerable impression on it beyond the Indus. The next invasion, that of Darius Hystaspes, occurred in the fifth century before Christ, and was preceded by an exploration of the country about the Indus by Scylax, the Persian admiral. What the precise extent of Darius's conquest was is not known; but it would seem that he exacted an exceedingly large tribute, for the amount realized is said to have equalled a third of the entire revenue of the Persian empire, and Herodotus remarks that, while the tribute of other places was received in silver, that from India was received in gold. From this time some sort of connection always subsisted between India and Persia; for we read that a body of Indian troops served under Xerxes during his expedition to Greece; that Ahasuerus (*Ártaxerxes Longimanus*) reigned "from India even unto Ethiopia;"* and that Darius Codomanus opposed Alexander with a body of Indians drawn from the most eastern part of his empire.

The sovereignty of Persia was broken up by the victories of Alexander the Great, who next passed over to India, crossed the Indus, and was opposed on the banks of the Jhelum by a king named Porus. We have before remarked that no clear account exists of the princes of the Solar race; and there is certainly nothing to show very precisely how the line became extinct. In the genealogy of the race the name of the last prince but four is given as *Prasenjit*, and this has been supposed by some writers to be identical with the Porus of the Greeks. If it be so, the line is traced. The very last prince named in the list, *Soomitra*, is said to have died a short time after the invasion of Alexander the Great, probably leaving no heirs; though the *Rájpoos* of *Mewár*, the *Ráhtores* who first established themselves in *Kanouj*, and afterwards in Central India, and

* Esther ii. 1.

all the princes of Northern India of recent times, have claimed descent from Râma. Porus, we read, though first taken prisoner, was afterwards restored by Alexander to his kingdom, which was much enlarged. Alexander also wished to cross arms with Mahânanda, who was preparing to receive him; but the progress of the conqueror was stopped on the banks of the Beyáh by the unwillingness of his own soldiery to proceed further, and he turned back to Babylon after a short excursion to the mouths of the Indus. According to Plutarch, it was the battle with Porus that took off the edge of the courage of the Macedonian soldiery, and made them unwilling to concern themselves further with the Hindus. It is certain that the disunion of the Hindu princes only rendered the conquests which were achieved by the invaders so easy.

We now come back to Nanda. Of him it is said that he was first simply king of Magadha, but became subsequently, by the force of his arms, the ruler of all India; that like Parusrâm, a fabulous hero of the Solar race, who is said to have exterminated the Kshetrias, he also waged a deadly contest with the warrior tribe; that he had two wives named Ratnâvati and Mura, by the first of whom he had eight or nine sons, collectively called the Sumályadicas, and by the second the celebrated Chandragupta and his brothers. Some accounts make Chandragupta a bastard, as being the son of Mura by Sákâtara, the prime-minister of Nanda. It is known that Nanda was murdered by his prime-minister, possibly at the instigation of Mura on her crime being discovered. The Sumályadicas succeeded in the first instance, and reigned conjointly according to some authorities, and one after another according to others. Mura had, however, created the vacancy for her own son, and Chandragupta was too clever to let the occasion go by. With the aid of Parvateswara, king of Nepál, and his allies the Javanas or Greeks, and the Sákás or Scythians, Chandragupta succeeded in overturning the reign of his half-brothers, killed them, and stepped to the throne, in B.C. 315. It is said that he retained a large body of Greeks in his pay, who

did good service in establishing his power. Some accounts mention that he reigned with justice and equity, while others maintain that he was hated and despised by the people for his cruelties. That he was very powerful is evident, for we read that Seleucus Nicator, who on the partition of Alexander's dominions obtained possession of Babylon and all the country thence to the banks of the Indus, having undertaken an expedition against Magadha, ostensibly to avenge the ill-treatment experienced by the Greeks retained in the service of its king, but really with a view to recover the Macedonian conquests in India, was obliged to give up the idea and to conclude an alliance with Chandragupta, giving him one of his daughters in marriage, and sending an ambassador (Megasthenes) to his Court.

The era of Vikramáditya follows that of Chandragupta and his successors; and one account makes the former the eighth in descent from the latter prince. The capital of Vikramáditya was, however, a distinct place—namely, Avanti, or Onjein—of which he ascended the throne in B.C. 56. His court was famous for a cluster of illustrious poets, known as the Nine Gems,* that graced it. This was the third great era of Sanskrit literature, the first being the age of the *Veds*, and the second that of the older *Puráns* and the great poems called the *Rámáyana* and the *Mahábhárat*, which are venerated as much as the *Puráns*. But Vikramáditya was prized as a great king irrespective of that circumstance, and especially for having opposed the conquest of the Scythians, who had just at this time overturned the Grecian kingdom of Bactria, and were pouring down upon India, of which all the country on the banks of the Indus to the mouths of that river were already occupied by them. Vikram succeeded in arresting their further progress eastwards, for which service he was vested with

* These were named Kalidás, Amarsingha, Dhanwantari, Varáhamihira, Vararuchi, Ghatakarpura, Betálabhatta, Kshapanaka, and Sanka.

the name of Sákári, or the foe of the Sákás. But, though the entire subjugation of India was thus prevented, it did not hinder the barbarians from spreading all over the country in small hordes, which formed the germs of those hardy races that afterwards defied the Mahomedan power so long in Rájasthán. In the meantime a powerful enemy to Vikramáditya had arisen in Saliváhana, a king of the Deccan, by whom he was attacked, defeated, and slain. The posterity of Vikramáditya were, however, not deprived of the sovereign power. The conqueror, satisfied with the victory gained by him, retired beyond the Nermuddá, leaving to the sons of the vanquished the throne of Oujein; and the descendants of Vikramáditya continued to reign on it till the time of the Mahomedan invasions.

Perhaps more powerful than Vikramáditya or Saliváhana were the Andhra Rájáhs of the following era, who reigned over Magadha and the Gangetic provinces generally, and were also known by the name of Karnas. One of these kings, at all events, named Mahá Karna, or Karna Daharya, aspired to be the lord-paramount of India. It is certain that these kings maintained a fleet of merchantmen, and extended their influence even over the islands of the Eastern Archipelago. They also kept up a constant intercourse with China, a good royal road to which existed through Assam; and, on one occasion, the Chinese Government is said to have sent over an army to assist one Andhra Rájáh in putting down a rebellion in India. The reign of these princes embraced a period of above eight hundred years, the dynasty being divided into three distinct branches, of—namely, (1) the pure and genuine Andhras; (2) the Andhra Jaticas, a spurious branch of the family; and (3) the Andhra Bhrityas, or servants of the family, who after the death of their legitimate sovereigns, divided the kingdom among themselves. The first branch of the dynasty ended in A.D. 436. The second terminated with a king named Pooloma, a great warrior, whose conquests eastward extended up to the boundaries of China, and who drowned himself in the Ganges in 648. The Bhrityas

succeeded when they saw that there was no one else to take up the crown, and divided the country into bits among themselves, upon which Magadha ceased to be reckoned as a powerful kingdom. The fact is, the whole of India was at this time in utter confusion and anarchy, all the great royal races having disappeared, while their vassals had risen on all sides and assumed the state and appellation of kings, splitting up the country in every direction. The country, in short, was preparing itself for the reception of the conquerors who were destined to make their appearance in it within a few years.

At about this time the Ráhtores established a new kingdom at Kanouj, under Básdeo their king; and it is said that during the reign of this prince, Bahrám Gor, king of Persia, visited India in the disguise of a merchant to hatch his schemes of conquest. A mere accident led to his being discovered: he was attacked by a mad elephant, which, as a keen sportsman, he killed with a lance; and this feat of hardihood led to a close inquiry on the part of Básdeo, that resulted in the stranger being recognised. Upon this the king of Persia was so well received that he was obliged to abandon all thoughts of hostility; and the friendship thus established was cemented by the marriage of Bahrám with a princess of Kanouj, whom, however, he is said to have deserted. After Básdeo, his descendants held Kanouj for a period of eighty years, when the throne was given to or usurped by a prince named Rámdeva, whose reign was chiefly spent in repressing revolts. He was succeeded by his general Pratápa at the time when the throne of Persia was occupied by Noshirwán the Just, who claimed from him a tribute said to have been agreed upon by Básdeo, but which had never been paid; and, on this claim being rejected, a Persian army marched into India and obliged Pratápa to make good the arrears. This greatly increased the internal confusion of the country; but the Hindu annals of the period are exceedingly meagre of information. The kingdom of Kanouj appears, however, to have retained its vitality to a later period; for we read that

Ádisoor, king of Bengal, in the eleventh century after Christ, sent to Virasingha, king of Kanouj, for five learned Bráhmans, those in Bengal having much deteriorated.

The next Persian attack of India was led by Noshized, the son of Noshirwán, and was directed against Balabhipore in Surát, through Scinde. This was the original seat of the Oodypore family, which derived its descent on the one side from Ráma, king of Ayodhyá, and on the other from Noshirwán of Persia, the children of Noshized having, after the conflict, settled among and intermixed with the Hindus. The Arabian invasions which followed were commenced in the seventh century, and continued till the middle of the eighth. They were still carried on through Scinde, and were confined to the neighbourhood of Surát, Cambay, and Cheetore, till they were checked by the vigorous resistance of two kings of Cheetore, named Báppá and Khomán, after which there were no further invasions for about one hundred and fifty years. But India was too rich, and its general condition known to be too weak, for any longer forbearance on the part of the Mahomedans. When the Kaliphat lost its glory, its empire was divided among its great secular feudatories, one of which was converted into the empire of Samaniá. The lieutenant of this empire, who resided at Ghazni, soon after became independent, and finding his subjects too warlike and turbulent to be easily controlled, gave them plenty of occupation by his expeditions into India. The empire of Ghazni then declined, and that of Ghor rose in its place; but it was all the same so far as India was concerned, the expeditions to it being continued till the principal Hindu monarchies were extinguished, and a Mahomedan sovereignty was founded at Delhi in A.D. 1194. The names of the last Hindu kings who were overthrown were Jaya Chandra of Kanouj, and Prithu Ráj of Ájmere and Delhi, the former said to be lineally descended from Vikramáditya.

From the account given above it will be seen that the universal deluge is recognised by the Hindus, though the

identity of Satyavratá with Noah is an unauthorized and unnecessary inference. The testimony available to us seems generally to indicate that India was well-peopled before the flood, in which Satyavratá, Aja, and Prithu, with perhaps all the Brahmádicás and Brahmárishis, were saved, just as Noah was saved elsewhere, and doubtless for the same purpose of repeopling their country. The migration of races from Babel, as given in the Mosaic account, did not apparently in any way affect countries so far to the east as India; and, in the absence of any especial provision for India, the descendants of Shem and Japheth have been promiscuously spoken of as having replanted it—indirectly, we suppose, through other nations. It remains to this moment undecided whether Sharma or Jayapati is to be recognised as the son of Satyavratá, for the simple reason that the learned are not yet agreed as to whether the Hindus are to be regarded as the descendants of Shem or of Japheth. A descent from Noah indirectly through other nations—that is, after such other nations had sufficiently expanded themselves—is, however, a theory that will not suit the case of India, which seems to have been peopled very early and very extensively, to justify assumptions like that of Ctesias, that, within two or three centuries after the flood, Semiramis was opposed and defeated by Stabrobates with an army four millions strong.

There is no doubt, however, that India was subject to barbarian irruptions from the earliest times from the direction of Irán and Tartary, and that its inhabitants, though not derived from those countries, intermingled with the races that occupied them, constantly from the commencement. In this sense, and to this extent, a Scythic or Iranian descent for the Hindus may be freely admitted; and the very existence in the country for ages of a lot of petty princes exercising sovereign authority within a limited jurisdiction, and only occasionally acknowledging the power of a paramount chief, is an argument of great force in favour of such intermixture, indicating that each conqueror who established a footing in the country settled

in it with his horde, freely intermixing with the conquered race so as in a short time not to be distinguishable from it. The large hordes thus brought in must have considerably facilitated the planting of the country; and this, we think, fully accounts for the infinite variety of races in India, with different forms and features peculiar to each.

Simultaneously with the planting of the country, we find the royal race dividing itself into two branches—namely, of the Sun and the Moon. If these distinctive names were assumed from the days of Ikshwáku and Buddha, the derivation we have suggested from the Mogul chief Oghuz Khán and his descendants will not stand, though we still acknowledge a great partiality for the idea. The grandson of Buddha, we find, was named Áya, or Áyus, which quite corresponds with the name of the second son of Oghuz, called Áy, or the Moon. The eras of Áya of India and Áy of Tartary seem also very nearly to correspond; and, adhering to our supposition, we infer that the races of the Sun and Moon were probably not so named till after the reign of Áya or Áyus of India, he being identical with the Áy of the Moguls. Against this assumption stands the express statement in the Mogul annals that only two members of the royal family, Kagan and Nayos, escaped from Tartary; notwithstanding which, the name of Áy might still have been perpetuated by his descendants.

The two grand divisions in religion, Bráhmaism and Buddhism, were also started probably from the commencement—i.e., from the age of Ikshwáku and Buddha. But at that time the country was not very populous, while Bráhmaism, moreover, adhered as yet only to the worship inculcated in the *Veds*, and necessarily did not differ very widely from the philosophical abstractions of Buddha, which accounts for the absence of any contests for supremacy between the two religions from the outset. It was only when the worship of demigods and heroes began to be substituted for that of fire, air, and the sun, that the Bráhmans and the Buddhas found themselves at direct

antagonism to each other; and, as the Buddhas by this time formed a large section of the community, the Bráhmans had no alternative but to declare a war of extermination, in which, at different ages, Parusrám, Ráma, and Nanda distinguished themselves. The first glorification of Buddhism was followed by the exterminating wars of Parusrám and Ráma. The religion was revived under Sákya Muni, in B.C. 588, after which followed the persecutions of Nanda and the Agnikoola Bráhmans of Rájpoótáná. Idol-worship probably began at about the age when Parusrám lived, which was very near that of Ráma, though precise dates cannot be determined. One story asserts that on Cambyzes, king of Persia, having conquered Egypt, the priests of that country, being obliged to fly from it, found their way into India, and there planted and propagated the Egyptian superstition. This would give Bráhmanism a commencement no earlier than B.C. 525; but surely idol-worship in India is of much earlier date, for Ráma is said to have worshipped the image of Párvati before proceeding to the conquest of Ceylon. Apart from that, our best orientalists are of opinion that Egypt was probably peopled from India—according to Sir William Jones, by a people named Sanganians, who dwelt near the mouths of the Indus and lived a barbarous and piratical life; and it would be more reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the mythology of Egypt was borrowed from that of India, than that India was indebted to Egypt for a religion which she delights to honour up to the present day. One thing is certain, that a very early communication by sea existed between India and Egypt, and necessarily with all the intermediate countries also.

This brings us to the subject of the early civilisation of India. The division of the country among a large number of petty kings, each of whom called himself the sovereign lord of the universe, prevented, as we have stated, India from ever becoming a powerful empire; but, notwithstanding this, she seems in her day to have become really very great in other respects (social, moral, and literary), and

long served as a model for imitation to a great part of the ancient world. From the remotest antiquity she was very generally regarded as the cradle of knowledge for the eastern, as Egypt was for the western world; and of the two, the Indian cradle was always the better esteemed. Even the Greeks, who owed almost everything to Egypt, considered the Hindus to be the wisest of all nations. The grammar, logic, rhetoric, philosophy, and ethics of India, were particularly prized; and Pythagoras and Plato seem to have imbibed their wisdom from the same source as Vyasa. The rage for imitation was so great, that even the institution of castes, which has had so injurious an effect on the mother country, was early adopted, apparently from India, both by Persia and Egypt, and we are only surprised to find that the rite of Suttee was not copied by any nation but the Tartars.* Of the religion of India, Buddhism, which has now disappeared from it, was so extensively disseminated, that even at this moment its followers all over the globe equal, if they do not exceed in number, the followers of Christianity, the religion being still extensively prevalent in China, Burmah, Siam, Thibet, Bootán, and Ceylon. Even the Bráhmaism of ancient times had its admirers; and the Bráhmans of the day were justly celebrated all over the world for their wisdom, simplicity of manners, and austerity of life. But what will strike the modern observer as most curious, is that the Hindus of old, whose descendants at the present day raise so many objections to leave their country on any account whatever, had a particular *penchánt* for commerce, and traded with the Chinese on one side, and the Persians, Arabs, and Egyptians on the other, and in subsequent ages even with Greece and Rome. The best silks in Persia were brought there by, coasting vessels from India; the finest linens, so prized by the haughty dames of Rome, went thither from Bengal; and, what is more, we are expressly told that they were

* Lassen thinks that the Hindus borrowed this rite from the Scythians, and he is apparently correct.

carried by native Indians themselves, whose dress and manners are particularly described. We also read, indeed, of fleets starting from the Egyptian ports for the coasts of Malabár and Ceylon, to purchase the products of the East in their own original markets; but the number of vessels that started from India was nearly as great as the number that repaired to it, notwithstanding that there were scarcely any imports to India in return except gold and silver—that is, the value of the articles sold by her. As a rule, India was content in all ages with her own productions and manufactures; or, if she did import any articles, they were only the luxuries and trifles of the western world, commonly associated with her civilisation. We read that Amitraghâta, (or the “foe-killer,”) the son of Chandragupta, wrote to Antiochus Soter, the son of Seleucus, to send him a quantity of sweet wine and figs. A better proof of the refinement of old Armitraghâta and his age could not perhaps have been advanced! Unlike, however, the state of things in China, India has not been able to retain such civilisation as she did reach, though she may not have drifted back to utter barbarism since. Her condition is best typified by her own banyan-tree of world-wide repute, which, after having ascended a certain height, grows downwards and takes root again in the earth.

CHAPTER IV.

. PERSIA.

THE name of Persia is supposed to be derived from Fârs, or Pârs, a division of the empire of Irân, and is applied by Europeans to the whole of that kingdom, including all the provinces to the east of the Tigris—namely, Assyria Proper, Media, Parthia, Fârs, and Herkania or Majenderân. Within this tract are several chains of mountains, and large, arid regions interspersed with beautiful valleys; but there are no great rivers, nor many lesser streams or springs. Some parts of the country are, for this reason, subject to great heats, the more so from having few trees to ward off the scorching rays of the sun; but the climate of the central provinces is considered to be salubrious, and the men there are active and robust. The soil generally is sandy and barren, and exceedingly dry; but in several places it is still said to be productive, especially in the valleys, which abound with vegetables of the most varied kind, that can be cultivated to any extent. The pasturelands, where they exist, are also rich; and both flowers and fruits have a luxuriant growth. Of animals, sheep are abundant; and there are also fine breeds of horses, mules, and camels. The mountains are either bare or thinly clad with underwood; the salt deserts are very extensive.

The history of the country may be broadly divided into two parts, ancient and modern; the first of which begins with much that is fabulous, and terminates with the conquest of the kingdom by the Arabians under Omar, while the second brings up the account from the latter point to the present day. The Persians do not profess to know who the first parents of the human race were. They believe time to be divided into a succession of cycles or periods,

like the Yugs of the Hindus, and allege that Mahábud was the person left at the end of the last great cycle, and was consequently the father of the present world. This Mahábud was blessed with a numerous progeny, who originally lived in the caves and clefts of rocks, but whom he taught to construct houses and towns, plant gardens, rear sheep, and make clothing out of the fleece of their flocks, and also all the benefits of commerce and art. Mahábud had thirteen successors of the same name, during whose reigns the world enjoyed a golden age. The last of these princes, abdicating his throne, retired to a life of penitence and devotion; upon which men began to become wicked, and soon converted the earth into a theatre of rapine and murder. To restore order, a saint named Jyaffram received the divine command to assume the throne, and established the Jyanian dynasty. He was succeeded by his son, Sháh Kuleev, the line extending to Mahábool, whom it has been attempted to identify, on the one side, with Belus of Assyria, and, on the other, with Bali, or Mahá-Bali, of the Hindus. After Mahábool a new dynasty was established by his son Yessan, which terminated with a prince named Ájum, or Yessan-Ájum; when, the wickedness of mankind having exceeded all bounds, an internecine war broke out which nearly depopulated the earth. The Persian accounts do not anywhere speak of the general flood. They only assert that the human race became nearly extinct from mutual enmity and wars.

In the era that succeeded, Kaiomurs became the first monarch of Persia. He is said to have been the son of Yessan-Ájum; but some ecclesiastical writers pretend to recognise him as a grandson of Noah, apparently on the most insufficient grounds, and with the sole object of making the Persian account accord with that of the Bible. The former goes on to say that Kaiomurs had to fight with an army of magicians who were his enemies, and marshalled against them an army of lions, tigers, and panthers; from which it may be inferred that the combatants on his side were utter barbarians (perhaps nomad tribes from the

north), while his opponents were the remnants of the old race in Persia, who, being more civilised, were put down as magicians and sorcerers. Kaiomurs defeated his enemies, and then brought his own refractory subjects—"the lions and tigers"—into obedience, "spreading the carpets of equity and benevolence over the habitable world." "Through the influence of his equity," continues the national account, "the magnet ceased to attract iron, and the amber refrained from oppressing the straw; while the sheep contracted alliance with the wolf, and the lion and the deer traversed the deserts together in amity."

After achieving all this the old king retired to his capital, Balkh, where he resigned his throne to his grandson, Houshung, who also proved to be a good sovereign, and founded many cities, and invented many useful arts; being the first to strike out fire from flint-stones, abstract iron from ore and work it into arms, construct aqueducts, and form garments from the skins of sables and foxes. His son and successor, Táháamurs, having made some of the magicians prisoners, was taught by them to read and write. In his reign the worship of idols was first introduced, originating, it is said, with the commemoration of deceased relatives and friends through the medium of busts and images. The next in succession was the celebrated Jemsheed, the founder of Persepolis, and the discoverer of wine. The invention of many useful arts is attributed to him, and also the division of the people into four classes—namely, of priests, writers, soldiers, and labourers and artisans. The great success of his reign at last made him impious, and he proclaimed himself a god, shortly after which his country was invaded by Zohauk, an Arab or Assyrian prince, before whom Jemsheed was obliged to fly, and by whom he was eventually captured and killed. Zohauk then ascended the throne, setting aside, but for a time only, the dynasty of Kaiomurs, otherwise called the Paishdádian dynasty. His reign was brief. "Like the sledge and anvil, proposing to himself hardness of heart and harshness of countenance, he flung away the veil of

shame and the curtain of good faith, so that he daily became more audacious in violating whatever was sacred, and in shedding the blood of the innocent." His cruelty at last became unbearable; the people revolted from him on all sides; and he was finally captured and killed by a blacksmith named Kawáh, whose apron from that day became the royal standard of Persia—a "badge of heroic poverty," as Gibbon calls it, "covered by a profusion of precious gems." It is supposed that the period of Zohauk's reign was that during which Persia was subject to the Assyrians under Semiramis. Feridoon, a descendant of Táhámuks, was made king on the Paishdádian dynasty being resumed, and his reign was a long and quiet one. He was succeeded by his great-grandson Manucheher, a good and pious monarch, who had a wise prime-minister named Sam, whose grandson, Roostum, is the great hero of Persian story. In the reign of Nouzer, the son of Manucheher, Áfrásáib, the son of Pushung, king of Turán (Tartary), invaded and conquered Persia, and ruled over it for twelve years. But Zál, the son of Sam, afterwards drove him out from Fárs, and raised Zoowáh, a descendant of Manucheher, to the throne. The son of Zoowáh, Kershasp, being found unequal to retain it, was substituted by Kaikobád, another descendant of Manucheher, who founded the Kaianian dynasty. The Tartars under Áfrásáib now again invaded Persia, but were so well received by Roostum that they were only too glad to retire, concluding a peace by which the Oxus was declared to be the boundary between the two empires. The reign of Phraortes, who succeeded Kaikobád, and ruled over both Media and Persia, is omitted by Persian authors, who name Kai-kaoos (Cyaxares I.) as the successor of Kaikobád. Kai-kaoos had to be twice rescued from the hands of his enemies by Roostum—namely, once from the Tartars, and on another occasion from the Arabians. But the great event of his reign was another irruption of the Tartars, led by Áfrásáib, which was again beaten back, in which Roostum fought with and killed his own son Sohráb, who had taken the side of the barbarians,

and whom the father, never having seen before, did not recognise. The reign of Astyages, like that of Phraortes, is again omitted by the Persian authors, Kai-khoosroo (Cyrus) being mentioned as the successor of Kai-kaos; which also leaves out the reigns of Cyaxares II. in Media, and Cambyzes I. in Persia.

The two thrones of Persia and Media, which had been variously occupied before the time of Cyrus, were united under him, one being inherited by him from his father, and the other from his maternal uncle, who left no heirs. The history of Persia after this period is best related in the accounts given by the Greeks. The Persian accounts of the reign of Kai-khoosroo are full only of the achievements of Roostum; while all that is reported of the king is, that he took possession of the cities of Samarkand and Bokhárá, and captured Áfrásáb, and killed him. The Greek accounts give much farther information—namely, that Cyrus was elected chief by all the Persian tribes; that he defeated Crœsus, king of Lydia, and took him prisoner, annexing the whole of Asia Minor to his own dominions; that he also conquered Babylon and all its dependent provinces, finally putting an end to the Babylonian empire; and that the Phœnician cities submitted to him of their own accord. His dominion therefore extended from the Oxus to the Arabian Sea, and from the Indus to the Mediterranean. He is further represented as having ruled over this vast territory with great wisdom and ability, regulated the civil government and the worship of the gods, and, by his own private conduct, established a model for the imitation of kings. The account of his death is differently related. Herodotus says that he was slain in battle with the Massagetæ; while Xenophon mentions that he died in the bosom of his family, exhorting his children to respect the gods, and to love and be faithful to each other. They asked him how his body was to be encased after death. "Enclose it not in gold or silver," said he; "restore it to its mother earth." Removing from his story all the romance with which it has been invested, Cyrus still retains the fame

of having been one of the greatest potentates of the ancient world. He was certainly happier than the other great ones whose names occur to us—than Semiramis, Sesostris, and Alexander, one of whom was assassinated, another died by his own hands, and the third from drunkenness.

Cyrus was succeeded by his son Cambyses II., though the Persian accounts place one Lohrásp intermediately on the throne. As often happens in life, the good counsels of the father had fallen on barren ground, and Cambyses proved to be a most unworthy son. His younger brother, Smerdis, was assassinated by his orders; and he married two of his own sisters, Meroe and Atossa, the first of whom he afterwards killed by a kick. In his reign Egypt, which had revolted,* was reconquered, while Lybia and Cyrene submitted to Persia of their own accord; but an expedition directed against Ethiopia was unsuccessful. Cambyses died of a wound received accidentally from his own sword, or, as others report it, killed himself in a fit of madness, upon which Smerdis, the Magian (who personated the brother of Cambyses that was murdered), was proclaimed king. This was an attempt of the Magi to replace a Median on the throne; and the plot was said to have been hatched in the seraglio. But the imposture was soon discovered, whereupon the Persian nobles entered into a conspiracy against the usurper, killed him after a reign of seven months, and raised Darius (the son of Hystaspes, or Gushtásp), one of their own number, to the throne.

The reign of Darius I. was remarkable for the many improvements effected by him in the internal and external administration of the empire. His first conquest was that of Babylon, which had seceded. He next entered India with a large army, and made the Punjáb and other adjoining territories tributary. He then invaded the country of the Scythians in Europe, by whom he was repulsed; but he succeeded in reducing Thrace and Macedon. The last

* Xenophon says that it was first conquered by Cyrus.

great idea which possessed him was the subjugation of Greece; and this was the rock upon which the Persian empire was eventually shattered. The suggestion came from Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus, who had married three husbands in succession, namely, her brother Cambyses, Smerdis the Magian, and Darius, and who, in the height of her impudence, wished to have Grecian women for her slaves. The revolt of the Asiatic Greeks, and the burning of Sardes, in which the Athenians assisted, fanned the flame. But the army which was sent to carry out the idea was thoroughly beaten at Marathon, and had to retire in confusion. The name of Darius will be better remembered for his having introduced the first regular system of government in Persia. He divided the country into twenty satrapies, and imposed a fixed tribute on each; reorganized the army, and constructed a navy with the assistance of the Phoenicians; and also effected a complete change in religion by rejecting the idol-worship which had hitherto prevailed, and adopting in place of it the creed of Zoroaster (Zerdosht), who is said by some authorities to have flourished in his reign, while others make him a Median or Bactrian king of great antiquity. For all these services Darius has been justly regarded by posterity as the greatest of Persian kings. His one only mistake was the deep-rooted antipathy he bore to the Greeks, which was further fomented in the time of his son by the cabals and intrigues of the Grecian exiles in his court—namely, the Pisistratidæ from Athens, and Demaratus from Sparta—who goaded Xerxes to the war that covered him with discomfiture and shame.

Xerxes I. is represented as an effeminate prince by the Greeks; but the Persians, who speak of him as Isfundear, describe him as a hero as great as their celebrated Roostum. It is scarcely necessary here to refer to all the reverses he experienced in Greece. Athens was captured and burnt; but this was all that he was able to achieve. The naval engagement off Salamis compelled him to return precipitately to Persia, while the army he left behind was after-

wards routed at Plataea, the remnants of his fleet being on the same day totally destroyed at Mycale. From having taken the offensive, Persia was after this obliged to maintain for thirty years a defensive war in Asia Minor, where the Greeks aided their colonies against her in their endeavours to establish their independence. As for Xerxes himself, he gave up the rest of his life to licentiousness and ease, in the midst of which he was murdered by Artabanes, the captain of his guards, while the Persian accounts maintain that Isfundear was killed in fight by the veteran Roostum. The first son of Xerxes was also murdered; and the second being absent in Bactria, the third, Árdisheer Dirázdust (Ártaxerxes I., surnamed Longimanus), ascended the throne. He reigned about forty years, and was much troubled by the victories of the Greeks under Cimon, the revolt of the Egyptians, who were supported by the Athenians, but whom he nevertheless eventually conquered, and the rebellion of his own satrap in Syria. His immediate successor, Ártaxerxes, his only legitimate son, was shortly after killed by a bastard brother named Sogdianus, who in his turn was slain by another bastard brother named Daráb, who ascended the throne as Darius II., surnamed Nothus, or the bastard. The Persian accounts say that Nothus was the son of Ártaxerxes I., by his own daughter Homái. The morals of the Persian court at this time were so corrupt that there is no unlikelihood in the story. Of Xerxes, it is said that he first made love to his brother's wife, but not succeeding with her, seduced her daughter, who was his own daughter-in-law. The marriage with one's own sister was quite a common thing in the country. Nay, Minutius Felix reproaches the Persians with marrying or criminally conversing with their mothers, by whom stepmothers, doubtless, are meant—a natural inference from the practice commonly observed of one king marrying all the young and handsome wives of his predecessor. •

The reign of Darius Nothus was much disturbed by constant revolts in different parts of the empire, the greatest being the revolt of the Egyptians, which was not finally

put down till the time of Ochus, or Artaxerxes III. His immediate successor, Artaxerxes II., had to put down the insurrection of his brother Cyrus, the younger, who was supported against him by a large army of the Greeks; the policy followed at this time, both by Persia and Greece, being to foment against each other the internal quarrels that raged in either kingdom, which found plenty of unpleasant occupation for both. The greatness of the Persian empire was now already on the wane; the kings were enervated by luxury and indolence; the insurrections and revolts on every side were frequent; and it was being seriously felt that it would not be possible to hold together the distant and disjointed provinces of which the entire dominion was composed. Artaxerxes III. tried hard to reunite the empire, and succeeded so far that he brought back Egypt under control; but, abandoning himself to pleasure afterwards, he was poisoned by one of his officers, a third Darius being placed on the throne under the surname of Codomanus. It was during the reign of this king that Alexander the Great carried his arms into Asia. The victory on the Granicus opened to him a path into Asia Minor. It was followed by the victories of Issus and Arbela, which reduced the Persian empire into a dependency of Macedon. The Persian accounts make Alexander the bastard son of Darius Nothus, to whom Olympias is said to have been first given by her father, but who rejected her on finding her breath to be offensive. The vanity of the nation must have invented this story, to soften down the shame and indignity of the Greek conquest to which they were obliged to submit.

On the sudden death of Alexander at Babylon, the generals of his army divided his vast empire among themselves; and Syria and Babylon, including Persia, fell to the share of Seleucus, who assumed the name of Nicator, or the conqueror, and established the dynasty of the Seleucidæ. He was succeeded by his son Antiochus Soter; and he by Antiochus Theos, in whose reign a tributary chief of the name of Arsaces (Ashk) revolted, slew the viceroy left by

Antiochus in Persia, and founded, in B.C. 256, what is called by western writers the Parthian dynasty of the *Ársacidæ*, which probably was of Scythic origin. *Ársaces* invited all the chiefs of provinces to join him in a move against the *Seleucidæ*, with a view to maintain their independence and free Persia from a foreign yoke. For this reason the era is called by eastern authors the "*Mulook-u-Tuaif*," or commonwealth of tribes. The detailed history given by them is a mere catalogue of names. The western writers divide the epoch into three distinct periods—namely, (1) the Syrian period, which extended from B.C. 256 to 130, and embraced the reign of seven kings, and was distinguished by reiterated wars with the *Seleucidæ*, till the Parthian empire was for ever freed from the attacks of the Syrian kings; (2) the period of the eastern nomad wars, extending from B.C. 130 to 53, and embracing the reign of five kings, during which violent wars were waged by Parthia with the nomad tribes of Central Asia, and its power greatly weakened; and (3) the Roman period, extending from B.C. 53 to A.D. 226, and embracing the reign of seventeen kings, which was mainly occupied by wars with Rome. Regarding this last period the Persian historians furnish no information whatever; but the accounts given by the western writers show that all the efforts made by the Romans to reduce Parthia were effectually repulsed, and that one Roman army, commanded by Crassus the Triumvir in person, was completely massacred in the reign of Orodes, the Parthian king, by his general named Surena. Eventually, however, the Parthians got divided amongst themselves, and this produced a state of anarchy, which led to the rebellion of *Árdisheer Babigan* (*Ártaxerxes*, the son of Babek), a common soldier, but said to be descended from Isfundear, or Xerxes I. He had served for some time as a general of *Ártaban*, the last Parthian king, and only rebelled on being driven into exile, after which he defeated *Ártaban* in three great battles, in the last of which *Ártaban* was slain; and thus was founded the Sassanian dynasty, in A.D. 226.

Árdisheer proved to be a great king, and extended his dominions considerably. The name of Parthia, which the western writers had given to Persia after the death of Alexander, ceased on his elevation, and his own countrymen hailed him as the restorer of the old empire, which was created by Cyrus and lost by Darius Codomanus. The disobedient satraps of the empire, who under the reign of the Ársacidæ had arrogated feudal independence, were reduced by him; and every intermediate power between the throne and the people was abolished. He also restored to the country the doctrines of Zoroaster, which had given way to idol-worship for several years. At last, sated with success, he resigned the government, in A.D. 240, to his son Sháhpoor, a worthy successor, who carried his arms into the Roman territories, defeated and took captive the Emperor Valerian, and raised an emperor himself, namely, Cyriades, a fugitive of Antioch, who wore the royal honours for a short period. The next king of any note was Nársi, or Nárses, who at first subdued the whole of Armenia, and gave the Emperor Galerius a signal defeat, but was in the end obliged to submit to Rome, and to surrender the province of Media, then known as Aderbiján. His grandson, Sháhpoor II., was more fortunate. He first chastised the Arabs, who had been committing many atrocities in Persia; and then, turning his arms against the Romans, recovered from the emperor the territory that had been given up by Nárses, obtaining with it the city of Nisibis, and again reducing Armenia into a province of Persia. After three or four intermediate princes of little note, Bahrám V., commonly known as Bahrám Gor, ascended the throne, in A.D. 420. His munificence, his virtue, and his valour have all been very highly praised. He repulsed an attack of the Tartars conducted by the khán of Transoxianá, made a successful incursion into the Arabian territories, and maintained an unequal contest with the Emperor Theodosius, which ended in a truce. He is also reported to have visited India in disguise, where he was discovered, and married to a princess of Kanouj. The ruling passion of his life was the love of the chase; his favourite game being the

pursuit of the *Gor*, or wild ass, which accounts for his peculiar surname. He met his death by a fall from his horse, and was succeeded by his son Yezdijird II.

The reigns of Yezdijird II. and Hoormuzd may be passed over as eventless. Firoze (Perosis), the next king, is best known for his alliances and wars with the chief of the White Huns, who possessed Transoxianá, and who at last defeated and killed him. He was succeeded by Pallas (Valens) and Kobád (Cabades), the last of whom carried on a successful war with the Emperor Anastasius, till the Romans, weary of the constant inroads of the Persians, founded a colony and impregnable fortress at Dárá, at a distance of fourteen miles from Nisibis, which the Persians complained of as a direct violation of the treaties subsisting between the two nations.

The son of Kobád was Noshirwán, surnamed the Just, better known to the Romans by the formidable name of Chosroes I., whose reign was celebrated as well for military exploits as for a wise and useful reorganization of the government. Noshirwán fought with three Roman emperors—Justinian, Justin II., and Tiberius II., reduced Syria, captured Antioch, and extended his empire to the shores of the Mediterranean. He at the same time conquered from the Tartars all the countries beyond the Oxus, as far as Fergháná; from India, all the provinces west of the Indus; and several districts from Arabia. In regulating his empire, he divided it into four great governments, established a fixed and moderate land-tax, and instituted strict regulations for preserving the discipline of his army. Over and above all this, he encouraged letters and learned men; collected and translated the literature of Greece and Rome; and borrowed from the Hindus the *Hitopadesa*, which for several ages was recognised as an original Persian production. It was during the time of this sovereign that Mahomet was born at Meccá; and it is said that the latter used to boast of his good fortune in coming to the earth when so good a king was reigning on it.

The empire of Persia began to break down after the

death of Noshirwán. His son, Hoormuzd IV., was not equal to the government, and was, after a short reign, set aside by his general, Bahrám; but Khoosroo Purvez (Chosroes II.), the son of Hoormuzd, having obtained the aid of an army from the Emperor Maurice, was able to defeat Bahrám and to ascend the throne. Khoosroo was grateful to Maurice for the assistance given to him; and, on Maurice being slain, he took the side of his son, invaded the Roman territories, and subdued several strong places, while he pillaged the rest. This hostility was repaid by the Emperor Heraclius, who compelled Khoosroo to fly, and the opportunity was taken by his own son Schironeh (Siroes) to seize and consign him to a dungeon, where he was famished and tortured to death. The reign of the parricide was extremely brief, only eight months, within which time he killed eighteen of his half-brothers, and made love to several of his stepmothers, one of whom killed herself to elude him. After this followed four years of anarchy, during which two females, Pooran-dokht and Árzem-dokht, were raised to the throne. In A.D. 632, Yezdijird (Isdegerdes III.), a grandson of Khoosroo, obtained the crown; and it was in his reign that the empire of Persia was subverted by the Arabians, or, as the Persian authors report it, "by a band of lizard-eaters," the last representatives of the Sassanian dynasty finding refuge in the distant court of China. The first attacks of the Arabs were made during the reign of Pooran-dokht, but were twice repelled by her general, Mehrán, the celebrated Durufsh Kawáni, or apron of Kawáh, being displayed on both occasions. The standard was afterwards captured by Syed-ben-Wákáss, the general of Omar, upon which reverses followed; and Persia submitted to the Arabs after two signal defeats at Kudseáh and Nahávand, the last battle being fought in A.D. 641. The subsequent history of the dynasties of the Arabs, the Turks or Seljuk Tartars, and the Moguls do not affect our present inquiry.

In the account, as given above, we have not referred to the version of Josephus and the Bible, that Persia was anciently called Elam, from Elam the son of Shem, by

whom it was peopled. This stands as an unsupported statement, without throwing any light on the subject beyond what is afforded by the mention of the name of Chedorlaomer as one of the ancient kings of the country who was defeated by Abraham. It does not at all explain the peopling of a large kingdom, having an antiquity quite as remote as that of India and China, with both of which it must have been co-existent. We have therefore preferred to rely on the records of the ancient Persians themselves, and such other profane annals as were accessible to us, which, if they be dark to some extent from an unnatural mixture of fables and pretensions, are not barren of information. It will be seen from what we have stated that the Persian writers, though giving the history of their country from the commencement of time, do not betray the knowledge of any deluge, partial or complete. It may be safely presumed from this that Irán, which was their original country, did not suffer from the flood, and this exemption from the visitation must also have extended to Turán (Scythia or Tartary), the high table-land of Central Asia, from which all the nomad hordes that peopled Persia appear to have been drawn. The total ignorance of both races of an event so generally recognised by other ancient nations is thus easily accounted for.

Curiously enough, however, the Persian writers acknowledge the general depravation of mankind at about the time when the deluge occurred in other countries, and assert that in their own country the human race was nearly extirpated by mutual slaughter and destruction. The account given by the *Zendávestá* is somewhat different. It says that on Airyana Veijo (Irán) being selected by Áhoormazd (God) for the residence of the Persians, Áhri-man (the author of evil) visited it with a plague and depopulated it, upon which the remnants of the population were compelled to emigrate to Fárs, or Pársis. But, in point of fact, we do not see that Irán was given up in this way: it was migrated from, not abandoned. What really occurred was probably this, that the two contiguous coun-

tries of Irán and Turán fell out for the first time at the period referred to, and that, in one of the violent collisions that followed, a great many people in Irán were slain, which induced some of the rest to fly from it to Fárs. But, if the hostility of Turán thinned the population of Persia in this way at this time, it was that hostility also which fully re-peopled it during the ages that followed. No doubt some benefit was derived by Persia from the migration of nations from Babel, by its very nearness to the spot; but it had no particular reason to be entirely dependent on the procreative power of Elam and his children when the fecund hive of the north, which was full of the generations born in it from the commencement of time, was already throwing out its superfluous hordes. The incursions of those hordes into Persia were constant, and were renewed as often as they were repelled; and, even when they were unsuccessful, they always left behind them a heavy deposit of barbarians for the better colonisation of the country. Nor were all their incursions unsuccessful. The very first prince of the second era of Persian history, Kaiomurs, if not himself a Tartar, appears to have fought at the head of Tartars for his throne, and to have had them afterwards for his subjects. In later years the conquest of Áfrásáb greatly facilitated the planting of the country; and we would not, perhaps, be altogether wrong if we took Cyrus himself as having been originally the Khákán of a large nomad horde.

Thus peopled, Persia had great facilities of being early civilised. Her intercourse with India was constant, particularly in very remote times, and even her language seems to have been derived from the Indian stock. Originally, the people of Persia were herdsmen and shepherds, subdivided into hordes distinguished from one another by different modes of life. The king Jemsheed was the first to classify them properly, and to assign them several duties and occupations—a distinction apparently borrowed from India, or derived from a common source. Jemsheed also introduced among his people a knowledge of agriculture, tillage, and cattle-breeding. He was, moreover, their first

legislator, and established a rude system of government, which was scarcely better developed in the days of Cyrus and Cambyses. The people of Persia were very ignorant in those ages, and the only government then understood was the collection of tributes from persons who could be made to pay them. It was not till the era of Darius Hystaspes that this state of things was improved. In time, however, the Persians became a very civilised nation. Of course their government was never anything but an arbitrary one; but, in this respect, it scarcely differed from the other governments in Asia. Possibly, the power of the king was more absolute than in some other countries, being uncircumscribed within any limits either by regulations or usage; but, in actual practice, many privileges were allowed to the people, especially to the merchant and the soldier classes; and, if the power of the king was very arbitrary, nothing less so would have held together the turbulent tributaries and wild nomad tribes over whom it was exercised. One great defect in the constitution was that the succession to the throne was not defined, and this was the cause of constant disputes which could not but distract and weaken the empire.

The manners and habits of the early Persians were very simple; but it is said that great hardihood was combined with this simplicity, the youths being all taught to ride, and also inured to the use of arms, particularly to shoot with the bow with dexterity. It does not appear, however, that they ever made very efficient soldiers. They were warriors by profession and training, and had a sense of gallantry and national honour, with much of that impetuosity which is mistaken for valour. But they had not that intrepid hardihood which makes the real soldier; they trusted more to their numbers than to their courage; they knew nothing whatever of discipline: and hence, all their pretensions and weakness were at once exposed the moment they came in contact with the Greeks. Their great hero Isfundear (Xerxes), with two millions of men at his back, went to Greece only to return covered with disgrace and confusion; while Alexander, with an avenging

army of thirty thousand men, not only overran, but annexed the whole of the Persian dominions. In later times—in the days of the Parthian empire, and afterwards—the Persians appear, indeed, to have not unsuccessfully contended with Rome; but this happened for the most part when the Roman power had well-nigh ceased to be formidable to any but its own oppressed subjects. The Persians also maintained, from the very commencement of their existence to comparatively modern days, a constant struggle with the Tartars. Here both parties were generally well-matched; and yet the Persians often fared the worst.

The manners of the kings and nobles of Persia were almost at all times exceedingly luxurious and dissolute, though exhibiting much outward polish and refinement. The civilisation attained by the nation culminated in the reign of Noshirwán, much of the progress made by them being attributable to their constant intercourse with the western powers, though doubtless the connection with Greece was in other respects exceedingly unfortunate. The religion of the first Persians consisted of the worship of one God; but this soon gave way to the adoration of the sun, planets, and fire, and that again to idol-worship, till the adoration of one God was re-established by Zoroáster in the time of Darius Hystaspes, apparently along with the adoration of fire. Zoroaster continued the rite (but did not originate it) of keeping up a burning flame continually. This is so very similar to the rite of *agnihotra*, as practised by the Bráhmans in India, that it is not improbable that one was borrowed from the other. The national religion of Persia now is Mahomedanism, as observed by the Sheáh sect. The national character, also, has considerably altered with its faith, and unfortunately for the worse. The literature of Persia is of a varied character. It comprises many works on theology and ethics, mostly derived from the Grecian school. Of sciences, the knowledge of the Persians has always been very limited; but they have, on the other hand, an innumerable number of books on poetry.

CHAPTER V.

ASSYRIA, MEDIA, LYDIA, AND TARTARY.

Assyria.

ASSYRIA and Babylon appear from the commencement to have formed but one empire; it is not necessary, therefore, to notice them separately. The country being well watered, and for the most part low and flat, was originally very fertile, but has since been decaying, and running into wilderness. Its climate was temperate and wholesome during the greater portion of the year, but very dangerous at particular seasons. Herodotus says, that in the land of the Assyrians it seldom rained; but the periodical overflowings of the Tigris and the Euphrates made amends for this general dearth of water, and the industry of the inhabitants supplied whatever else was wanted, by the excavation of canals, which cooled the air and softened the soil, and rewarded the labours of irrigation by yielding bumper crops of corn. The products comprised wheat, barley, millet, and sesame; also honey, wine, olives, and figs: and, the yield being more plentiful than was required for the country, a lively commerce by land was carried on from the earliest times with Persia, and a maritime trade, possibly, with India, and certainly with the west.

The fabulous history of the country commences with the creation of the world, when Alorus was declared by God Himself to be the pastor of His people. Ten kings in all are said to have reigned over it from the creation to the flood, the last being named Xixuthrus. During this time the knowledge of letters, arts, and sciences, and, in fact, of all useful requirements, was taught to mankind by a strange being, partly man and partly fish, named Oannes,

who came out from the sea daily to communicate his instruction. The great deluge occurred in the reign of Xixuthrus, who was directed by Saturn in a dream to build a ship, and to put into it whatever he desired to preserve. The ship rested on a mountain, and when the waters abated all who were in it came out; but Xixuthrus, his wife, his daughter, and the pilot, who had first disembarked, were called away by name to dwell with the gods, which probably means that they lost their lives by some accident, perhaps by dropping off from the mountain.

The above is the account of Berosus, who collected the antiquities of the Assyrian empire. It does not differ much from the Mosaic history of the world before the flood, the names of Adam and Noah being substituted for those of Alorus and Xixuthrus. The history of the empire after the flood commences with Nimrod—the son of Chus, the son of Ham—who is spoken of in the Bible as “a mighty hunter before the Lord.” The capital of it was Babylon, which owed its origin to the foolish vanity of the immediate descendants of Noah, or Xixuthrus, who longed for the erection of a tower to render their names immortal. The tower thus raised was thrown down by a hurricane; but it is difficult now to determine whether it was built and destroyed before or after the time of Nimrod. Its ruins are called Birs Nimroud; but that does not settle the question one way or the other, the site having been built upon a second time after the destruction of the tower. The probability is that Nimrod came back after the general dispersion of nations from Babylon, when his father, Chus, went out and settled in Ethiopia, and that, on the city being then rebuilt, he was worshipped in it as a god, under the name of Belus. Babylon thus became the capital of the province of Shinár; and, having afterwards succeeded in establishing an empire around it, Nimrod went out from the land of Shinár and built another city in the northern confines of his empire, which he named Nineveh, after his son Ninus, whom he wanted to immortalize.

Nimrod was succeeded by Ninus, who made Nineveh the

largest and noblest city in the world. He was also, like his father, a great captain, and extended his conquests far and wide, to Arabia and Egypt in one direction, and to Media and Bactria in another. For the conquest of Bactria he is said to have assembled an army of nearly two millions of men; notwithstanding which he had to fight very hard for its reduction. In this war he was assisted by the genius of Semiramis, or Samáraymat, the wife of one of his officers, named Menon; and, being smitten by her courage and beauty, he asked her husband to give her up to him, upon which Menon killed himself in rage and despair. Another account asserts that Semiramis was only a common courtesan, whose grace and beauty having attracted the king, he lived with her for several years before he agreed to make her his wife. She was eventually raised to the imperial bed, and the issue of the marriage was a weak prince named Ninyas. For a long time after her husband's death, however, the sovereign power was actually exercised by Semiramis alone, whose aptitude for business was as uncommon as her courage. She first turned her energies to beautify Babylon, which owed much of its original magnificence to her exertions. Next, she enlarged by her conquests the dominions left by her husband, conquering Ethiopia on one side, and Persia and Medea on the other. She also invaded India with an army nearly three and a half millions strong, but was repulsed by Stabrobates, the king of that country. On returning from this last expedition she found that her son was conspiring against her, upon which she voluntarily abdicated the throne, notwithstanding which she was murdered. One account says that she acknowledged an incestuous passion for her son, and asked him to satisfy her wishes, whereupon he killed her with his own hands. The idea is simply ridiculous, since Semiramis was at this time in her sixty-second year; but her life generally had been a very wanton one, as, ever after the death of Ninus, she is said to have daily taken to her arms the comeliest men of her army by turns. Alexander found an inscription on the frontiers of Seythia, in which

Semiramis is thus made to speak of herself: "Nature gave me the body of a woman; but my actions equalled me to the most valiant of men. I governed the empire of Ninus, which towards the east touches the river Hinamum (the Indus), towards the south the country of incense and myrrh (Arabia Felix), towards the north the Sákás (Scythians) and the Sogdians. Before me no Assyrian had seen the sea; I have seen four where no one goes, so distant are they: what power opposes their overflowings? I compelled the rivers to flow where I desired, and I desired only where they could be useful; I rendered fruitful the barren land by watering it with my rivers; I erected impregnable fortresses; I pierced with roads inaccessible rocks; I paved with my own money highways where before were seen only the footsteps of wild beasts. And in the midst of all these occupations I found time enough for me and my friends." The conclusion of this bravado almost reads as an acknowledgment of the licentious life which she is said to have followed. The oracle had foretold that in one part of Asia she would be worshipped after death as a god; and the learned affect that Semiramis and the goddess Shámá Devi of India are one.

The successors of Semiramis for thirty generations were exceedingly weak, of whom all that has been certainly recorded is that they lived and died in their palaces at Nineveh, whiling away their time in hunting tame lions and wild asses. It was during the government of these princes that the tables were turned by the Egytians, who, having before been conquered by the Assyrians, now overran Assyria, in B.C. 1491, under the lead of their valiant sovereign Sesostris. The power of Sesostris, however, died with him, and was not sustained by his successors, and Assyria was on that account soon able to regain her independence without much exertion of vigour on the part of her native princes.

The best remembered of the Assyrian kings are Tiglath-Pileser I., whose reign forms an era in Assyrian history, and who extended the limits of his power from Babylon

on one side to the Mediterranean on the other; Asoor-Názir-Pál, who was passionately fond of the chase, and was a great builder; Salmanessur II., in whose time the Assyrians first came in direct contact with the Israelites; Tiglath-Pilesur II., who waged several wars with Syria, and annexed nineteen districts to Assyria; Sárگون, who defeated the Israelites and carried them into captivity, and was afterwards, throughout his reign, busy in consolidating his empire, and in improving and beautifying Nineveh; Sennácherib, who seems to have been conspicuous for the vices of his race, and is best known to us for his attack of, and repulse from Jerusalem; Esarhaddon, who made himself master of Babylon, and reunited it to the Assyrian empire; Asoor-Bani-Pál, more commonly called Sárdanapalus, whom the Greeks speak of as an exceedingly effeminate sovereign, while the Assyrian inscriptions describe him as one of the greatest warriors of his age; and Saracus, the son of Sárdanapalus, in whom the weakness of the Assyrian character appears to have culminated, and who, on his officers rebelling against him, is said to have raised a pile of wood, in which he burnt himself, his women, and his treasures, upon which the Assyrian empire was divided among the conspirators, and branched into the three kingdoms of Babylon, Nineveh, and Media.

Of the distinct kings of Babylon, the only names to be noted are those of Belasis, or Nabonassar, who divided the Assyrian empire with Tiglath-Pilesur II.; his successor, Merodach-Baladan, who was contemporaneous with Sárگون and Sennácherib; Nabopolassar, originally an officer in the service of Nineveh, but who afterwards revolted and established the independence of Babylon; Nebuchadnezzar, his son, by whom Babylon was greatly improved, if not wholly re-erected; Evil-Merodach, known only for his debaucheries, but whose wife Nitocris was a remarkable woman, who erected many noble edifices in Babylon; and, lastly, Belsházzar, in whose reign the kingdom was taken by the Medes and the Persians.

The antiquity of the Assyrian empire is unquestioned;

but the account we have of it is very incomplete. Of the government of the country we know little; but the people are understood to have possessed fixed abodes and political institutions from the earliest times; and, if the story about the tower be true, it is more than probable that it was here that the first notions regarding fixed abodes and political institutions were conceived. The government when fully formed was apparently despotic and even tyrannical; the laws were vague and uncertain; and greater weight was attached by the people to the varying passions and caprices of the king. Many of the kings even claimed divine worship; but the national religion was Sabea, and consisted in the adoration of the stars, though idols appear to have been afterwards added to their number. Of this religion the Chaldees were the priests: they are also said to have cultivated philosophy and the sciences, especially astronomy, and to have recorded observations of the heavenly bodies some two thousand years before the Christian era. Of the civilisation of the people the best proofs were in the commerce they carried on by land and water; and also, to some extent, in the superbness of the edifices they constructed both in Babylon and in Nineveh. There is no doubt, however, that they were extremely luxurious and effeminate, as the Greeks have represented them, that representation having in no way been disproved by their inscriptions and monuments.

Media.

Media was so called from Madai, the third son of Japheth, who peopled it; though some pretend to deduce the name from Medus, a son of Medea and Jason, and others from Medea herself, who is said to have retired to it on being forsaken by her lover. There is no history of the country anterior to the flood; but possibly that of Persia embraced it. The mountains and forests of Media being extensive, the climate of it was excessively cold. The part contiguous to the Caspian was unhealthy on account of the

vapours rising from that sea ; but of other places in it the air was very wholesome, though they were all subject to heavy rains and violent storms. The Medes were at one time the ruling nation and a very warlike people, and they had their own government and laws—those laws which are referred to in the Bible as being unchangeable.* They were governed by their own sovereigns till the time of Ninus, the son of Nimrod, who conquered their king, Pharnus, and annexed Media to the Assyrian empire. Subsequently, the weakness of the Assyrians becoming conspicuous, the Medes were able to re-organize themselves into a great power, though the history of the period is not very well known to us. Their independence appears to have been first established by a general named Arbaces, who was succeeded by one Dejoces, who by great tact and prudence, prevailed on the people to elect him as their king. The name of Dejoces appears in the Assyrian inscriptions, and he is said to have been a very subtle and crafty man, by whose reign, however, Media was largely benefited. He founded and furnished a new capital named Ecbátaná, humanized and softened the manners of the people, made laws for their good government, and never engaged in war with any of the neighbouring powers.

Dejoces died in about B.C. 650, leaving his dominions to his son Phraortes, who was of a martial disposition. The new king soon picked a quarrel with the Persians, and getting the better of them, annexed their country. He also subdued several other of the neighbouring nations, and was at last emboldened to attack Assyria, upon which he was defeated and slain by Nebuchadnezzar. His son Cyaxares I. eagerly went forward to revenge his father's death, and acting in concert with Nabopolassar of Babylon, took and destroyed Nineveh ; but all further conquests were suspended by an irruption of the Scythians, which compelled Cyaxares to fly to the defence of his own kingdom which was being devastated by them. At first the Medes were defeated by the Scythians,

* Dan. vi. 8.

by whom the whole of Media was overrun and held for several years ; but eventually, by a stratagem and pretence of friendship, Cyaxares succeeded in inveigling the barbarians to a general feast, where they were made drunk and massacred, those who escaped finding refuge in Lydia. This caused a disagreement between the Medes and the Lydians, and led to a war which lasted for five years, till it was accidentally brought to a favourable termination. While the last battle was being fought, a total eclipse of the sun came on, and the combatants on both sides, being equally frightened by an event so unusual, interpreted it as an expression of the displeasure of the gods at their antagonism, and patched up a peace on the field of battle, which was rendered inviolable by the marriage of the daughter of the Lydian king with the son of the king of Media.

Cyaxares was succeeded by his son Astyages, who had two children—one a son, who succeeded him in Media as Cyaxares II. ; the other a daughter, who was married to Cambyses, prince of Persia. As Cyaxares II. died childless, the son of Cambyses, Cyrus, succeeded to the thrones of both Media and Persia, and thus did the two kingdoms come to be united.

The claims of Media to great antiquity are fully established by the constant blending of its history from the earliest times with the histories of Assyria and Persia. The nearness of the country to Babylon rendered it impossible that it should be overlooked by the colonising parties that emigrated thence on the confusion of languages ; and, in process of time, it also received several colonies from the adjacent countries, which were invited to settle in it by the fruitfulness of its soil, from which circumstance, doubtless, the people came to be so early divided into a large number of tribes. A short while after being thus peopled, Media became a subject kingdom, and continued to be so for a considerable time, till the decline of the Assyrian power. Its subsequent independence did not exceed a period of two hundred years, for twenty-eight

out of which it was held under partial subjection by the Scythians, after which it was annexed to Persia. It is not surprising, therefore, that from being a very war-like nation at the commencement, the Medes soon became one of the most effeminate in Asia. Some authors charge them with having introduced the practice of castrating men, though others attribute that to the Persians. We have noticed the existence of eunuchs in China, and infer that the art of emasculation must have been everywhere fortuitously learnt. All the crime and effeminacy in Media followed the subjection of the country by the Persians: Cyaxares left a very powerful empire behind him.

Lydia.

Lydia derived its name from Lydus, the son of Atys, who founded its first dynasty of kings. Like Media, this country also has no history prior to the flood; but there is no doubt that the Lydians were a very ancient people, since their second dynasty of kings, the Heraclidæ, or descendants of Hercules, began to reign before the Trojan war, having been preceded by a long line of sovereigns called the Atyadæ. The riches of the country were well known to the ancients. Being watered by many rivers, its soil was extremely fruitful, and produced a large variety of grains. It was still more celebrated for its exquisite wines, and was rich also in mines, from which Cræsus is said to have drawn his immense wealth. Of its trade no particular information exists; but its capital, Sardes, was a commercial city of great importance, besides being the principal market for slaves, and the manufactures of Lydia were reported to be of various kinds, though consisting only of articles of luxury.

The first king of Lydia was Manes, the son of the Earth; possibly of mean extraction. He was succeeded by his son Cotys; he by his son Atys; and he by Lydus, who gave his name to the country. Of the kings that followed there is a long catalogue of names; but no events worthy

of notice are mentioned. The second dynasty commenced in B.C. 1223, with Argon, the great-grandson of Alcæus, the son of Hercules. Of the successors of Argon very little is stated till we come to the last king of the line, named Candaules, who had the misfortune of having a handsome wife, who, in concert with her lover, Gyges, one of the chief officers of the Court, had her husband murdered. Gyges succeeded to the throne in B.C. 727, commencing a new dynasty named the Mermnadæ. In the reign of his son Ardyes, the Cimmerians, expelled from Europe, invaded and overran all Asia Minor, and possessed themselves of Sardes, which was not recovered till the reign of Alyattes, the grandson of Ardyes, who drove out the Scythians. A disagreement with the Medians was also settled by Alyattes in an amicable manner, as has been noticed already.

The successor of Alyattes was his son Cræsus, whose name has become a synonym for great riches. He was also a great warrior, and conquered all the provinces contiguous to Lydia—namely, Paphlagonia, Bithynia, Pamphylia, and all the countries of the Carians, Ionians, Dorians, and Æolians; but his name will perhaps be best remembered as that of a liberal patron of learning and learned men. He took great delight in literature and the sciences; and his good-nature and affable manners have been much extolled. But with these virtues he had one great weakness: he prized his riches and magnificence unduly, and thought himself very happy on that account, till he was undeceived by Solon when he visited his Court, and by the practical lesson taught him by Cyrus, king of Persia, whom he had wished to conquer, but who defeated him and took him prisoner, in B.C. 549, annexing the whole of his dominions to Persia.

The petty states of Asia Minor do not require a separate notice in this place, not having been particularly distinguished in any way in ancient times; and we have referred to Lydia only because with it almost the whole of Asia Minor was absorbed into the Persian empire. All

these states were colonised originally, more or less, by immigrants from the interior of Asia, and subsequently also by immigrants from Greece; and, from the time of Troy downwards, they were mainly known in history as the theatre of all the wars carried on between the nations of Europe and Asia. In Lydia, the only Scythic irruption was that of the Cimmerians in the seventh century before Christ, and it is said that they held a part of the country for several years; but this was long after it was fully peopled. Josephus, and after him all the ecclesiastical writers, attribute the planting of the country to Lud, the fourth son of Shem; but this opinion has since been generally rejected, as having no foundation beyond a mere similitude of names. The government of Lydia was absolute and hereditary. The character of the people was very warlike at the outset, but afterwards became equally voluptuous and effeminate. Their religion, manners, and customs resembled those of the Greeks and Trojans; but they had one disgraceful custom peculiar to them: they allowed their daughters to prostitute themselves that they might earn a competent dowry to enable them to marry.

Tartary.

It is not easy to fix the exact boundaries of Tartary, which at different times has been known by different names, and appears also to have possessed different dimensions. The Scythia of ancient times comprehended a very considerable part of the globe, from the frozen ocean on the north, to the Caucasus, the Hindu Koosh, and the Himáláyá mountains on the south; from the confines of Europe on the west, to those of China, or rather, passing by the north of China, to the Sea of Japan and the Pacific Ocean on the east. Even the dimensions of modern Tartary, which embrace a smaller territory, include all the country between the Caspian Sea on the west, and the Imaus, or Altain Mountains, on the east, and from Siberia on the north, to the Hindu Koosh and the river Oxus on the south. The territory thus bounded has been the home

of a succession of warlike tribes, known from time immemorial indiscriminately under the designations of Scythians, Tartars, Moguls, Huns, Kálmuks, Mántchoos, Uzbegs, Sungarians, Getæes, Massagetæes, Tungoosies, and Turks, all supposed to have been derived from one primary stock, which probably originated with the creation of the world. For a long series of ages almost all these tribes were nomads in the strictest sense of the word, their situation, wants, and habits being the same; all too impatient to cultivate the earth, and too restless to remain stationary; all equally without cities or fixed abodes, and recognising no political association but a patriarchal government. Their lands were barren and boundless, fit only for pasture; and all their riches consisted of flocks of horses, camels, sheep, and goats. They carried their families with them in large waggons, and ranged from place to place in search of conquests or pleasure; living entirely on the flesh and milk of their own flocks, and on such fruits as they found growing wild; at one time giving evidence of their extraordinary abstinence, at another repaying that self-denial with a voraciousness equally extraordinary when the occasion for abstinence was over. Of such a people the historical accounts that did exist must necessarily have been extremely vague and indefinite; of many there never were any accounts at all. It is scarcely possible, therefore, to give any connected details in respect to them.

The following is a list of the Scythic kings mentioned by western writers, but without any note of time or succession, and scarcely any particulars as to the tribes or nations over whom they ruled ;—

1. Scythes.	8. Indathyrsus.	15. Spárgápithes.
2. Napis.	9. Tárgitáus.	16. Ariapithes.
3. Phithrá.	10. Colaxais.	17. Scylas.
4. Sagillus.	11. Scholypethes.	18. Octámasades.
5. Madyes.	12. Panaxagoras.	19. Ariantes.
6. Thomyria.	13. Tanais.	20. Athias.
7. Jancyrus.	14. Sanlius.	21. Lambinus.

The very little that is known of some of these princes may be stated as follows: The Greeks affect that the first,

Scythes, was a son of Hercules, begotten on a monster; but this supposition is simply absurd if Scythes is intended to be understood as a patriarch of the race, since the Scythic nation must surely have had a much earlier origin. Of the fourth prince, Sagillus, it is mentioned that he was sent by his father to the assistance of Orithyá, queen of the Amazons, against Theseus, king of Athens, but that he did not assist her. The fifth, Madyes, is known to have driven the Cimmerians out of Europe, pursued them to Asia, subdued the country of the Medes, and reigned over Upper Asia for a period of twenty-eight years. Madyes also invaded Egypt, but was bought off thence by Psammethichus. The sixth, Thomyris, was a queen of the Massagetæ, of whom it is said that she received an offer of marriage from Cyrus the Great of Persia, which she rejected, wisely suspecting that her kingdom and not her person was the object of his wishes. The Massagetæ were thereupon attacked by Cyrus; and it was in one of the engagements that followed that Cyrus, as reported by Herodotus, was killed. The seventh prince, Jancyrus—or, according to Herodotus, the eighth, Indathyrsus—laughed to scorn the demand of Darius Hystaspes for the usual presents of earth and water in token of subjection, and totally defeated him when he attempted to enforce the demand. The fable regarding the ninth, Tárgitáus, as received by Herodotus, was that he was born of Jupiter by a daughter of the river Borysthenes, and that he had three sons, the youngest of whom, Colaxais, succeeded him, in whose reign a plough, a yoke, an axe, and a golden bowl dropped from heaven on Scythic land. The twentieth prince, Athias, is remembered as having defied the power of Philip, king of Macedon, upon which there was a bloody war between the parties, in which both claimed the victory. We may add to these the names of Pushung and Áfrásaib, known in connection with their wars with Persia, over which the latter reigned for twelve years, till he was driven out by Zál, and afterwards killed by Cyrus.

Of the Turks, Tartars, and Moguls, a separate account is

given by Ábulgázi, a khán of the Usbeks, who ruled in Khárisim. They derive their descent from Turk, the son of Japhis, whom the sacred writers are anxious to identify with Japheth, merely because the names happen to correspond. Turk received the surname of Japhis Ogláni, and, succeeding to the rule of the family after his father's death, taught his followers to make tents and erect huts. From him his descendants were called Turks, while the country acquired by him was named Turkestán. He was succeeded by his son Táunak, who was contemporaneous with Kaiomurs, king of Persia, and is well known for many inventions, especially for discovering the use of salt. The fourth in descent from Táunak was Alanzá Khán, who had two sons, named Tátár and Mogul, between whom he divided his dominions. Of the Tartar (Tátár) line the only notable prince was Siuntz Khán, who succeeded after several intermediate chiefs of lesser fame, and being jealous of Il Khán, the chief of the Moguls, had a great fight with him, which resulted in the subversion of the Mogul power. Before we come to this era, however, there are several conspicuous Mogul princes to notice. Kará Khán, the son of Mogul, was a very powerful prince; but in his time the worship of idols had become dominant in his tribe, and he himself was a staunch idolater. His son Oghuz Khán, whom some foolish writers would fain confound with Og, king of Bashan, was, on the contrary, devoted to the worship of one God, and even abandoned two of his wives who refused to depart from idolatry. This armed his own father against him, and he was attacked by him at the head of a large army, the result of which was that Kará Khán was defeated and slain. Oghuz, ascending the throne, waged a war of extermination against idolatry, and re-established the worship of one God, not only among the Moguls, but also among the Tartars. He, likewise, extended his conquests in other directions, first reducing Samarkand and Bokhárá, whence he proceeded to India, where he conquered Cashmere. His next expeditions were directed against Irán (Persia), Armenia, and Khorássán.

This occurred, it is said, when Houshung, the grandson of Kaiomurs, reigned on the Persian throne. He is also said to have made himself master of China. It is impossible to get at dates; but the era of Oghuz is said to have preceded that of Chingez Khán (A.D. 1164—1227) by about three thousand years, which would bring it down to say, B.C. 1800: sufficiently early to reconcile the partial colonisation of China, India, and Persia by the Moguls—that is, after those countries had been already peopled to some extent from within. The sons of Oghuz Khán were named Kiun, or the Sun; Áy, or the Moon; and Juldus, or the Star. We have referred already to the wars between Il Khán, the Mogul king, and Siuntz Khán, king of the Tartars, which put a period to the Mogul empire in Tartary. This would just be the time (between B.C. 1600 and 1500) for the descendants of the Sun, Moon, and Star to emigrate to the adjoining countries, which, though already planted, were perhaps not yet sufficiently strong to be able to repel the aggression of a warlike Mogul horde. We read, further, that the survivors of the Mogul race traversed over very high mountains in their flight, and came at last to a beautiful country, which they called Irgáná Kon, which was so defended by mountains as to shelter them from all further pursuit. This would seem to describe India very faithfully. We read again, that about four hundred and fifty years after, the descendants of these Moguls, having become very numerous, found the country of Irgáná Kon too narrow for them, and wishing to return to their own country, marched out through an opening of the mountains with great joy. Can this possibly refer to the retirement of Yudisthira (of the Lunar race) from India to Tartary after the battle of Kurukshetra, which placed the issue of Arjun on the throne of Indraprastha, and left no available country for the rest? The dates seem approximately to correspond.

The chief who conducted the Moguls back to their own country was Bertezená Khán, who, having defeated the Tartars and overturned their empire, re-erected that of his own tribe. The next great chief of the family was another

Juldus Khán, who had two children, a son and a daughter, whom he married together. He died shortly after, subsequent to which his wife Aláncu conceived by a spirit, or—as she explained herself before the elders of her race—by an extraordinary pillar of light, which appeared unto her, and penetrated her person three several times. In due course this immaculate widow was delivered of three sons, who, of course, became great chiefs, under whom the Moguls came to be divided into separate hordes. Skipping over all princes of mediocre ability, we come to a prince named Támáná, who is said to have left his subjects in a very flourishing condition. The third in succession to him was Jessugi Báyardur Khán (by some named Pisouca Báhádur), the father of Támuzin, or Chingez Khán, as he was afterwards called. Támuzin was thus directly descended from the miraculously conceived children of Aláncu, being of the line of Budensir Mogak (or Buzengir), the third and youngest of them, in whose family the sovereignty of the Moguls was, by the choice of the people, confined. The history of Chingez Khán and his descendants is well known. The former laid the foundation of a monarchy more extensive than that conquered by Alexander the Great, while the latter completed that empire after him and consolidated it. The efforts of Chingez were first exerted towards reducing the different Tartar tribes to his authority, in which he fully succeeded. He then occupied the northern districts of China, to the rescue of which from the Kin Tartars his immediate predecessors had been invited, and which from that time forward formed the base of operations of all the Mogul expeditions into the celestial empire. After this he invaded Khárisim, and took Bokhára and Samarkand; from whence his armies overran Persia and Asia Minor, whilst on the north they penetrated as far as the Volga, and defeated the grand-duke of Russia. On the death of Chingez his empire was divided between his three sons, Zagatai Khán, Tuli Khán, and Octai Khán, and his grand-son Bátou Khán, the son of his eldest son Touschi,

who died before him. The youngest son, Octai Khán, succeeded his father as chief or khákán. Bátou Khán, the son of Touschi, is chiefly celebrated for the raid he made into Europe, compelling the Russians to become tributary to the Tartars, and spreading desolation through Poland and Hungary. Haláku, one of the sons of Tuli, overran Persia and Asia Minor, established the Mogul dynasty of Persia, and even appeared on the banks of the Indus, whence he was bought off by the emperor of Delhi. Kublai Khán, another son of Tuli, completed the conquest of China, and afterwards became chief of the whole empire of Tartary.

The very important part which the Scythic tribes played in the ancient world naturally gives rise to a regret that so little should really be known of their origin and early history. Josephus asserts that they were descended from Magog, the son of Japheth, and he has been followed by many of the fathers and a great number of modern historians who could find no better authority; and much ingenuity has been expended in deriving the word Mogul from Magog, the progress of conversion being successively exhibited as follows: Magog, Magogli, Mogli, Mogul. The subject is very obscure, and we do not wish to dogmatise on it; but probabilities and inferences seem to indicate that the Scythians, or Tartars, were a very ancient people, quite as ancient as the Chinese, Hindus, and Persians; and, for the reasons already explained in speaking of those nations, we are disposed to infer that Tartary was peopled from the creation of the world, irrespective of other arrangements made for other places. The very remoteness of the country seems to favour this hypothesis; and the traditions of it, so far as they are known, tend towards the same conclusion. The era of Oghuz Khán, we have stated already, was at least as old as B.C. 1800. He is expressly mentioned as having been contemporaneous with Houshung of Persia; and, as a large number of antecedent princes are named, in going backwards to the root, we arrive, it seems to us, to

about the same age as that of Pwankoo in China, the Brahmádicas in India, Mahábud in Persia, Alorus in Assyria, Protogonus in Phœnicia, and Hephæstus in Egypt. To this it may be answered that we really know nothing of any of those parties—that all the suppositions in regard to their age and history are purely chimerical. This, perhaps, is true to a great extent; but the theory involved in those suppositions is nevertheless as good as any other that has been advanced, and derives some support from such annals of the different countries as are known to us, so far as they bear upon the subject.

The absence of any reference to the deluge in the traditions of Irán and Turán has been noticed before; and, assuming that Turán began to be peopled from the commencement of the world, this in itself will explain the great prolificness of the northern hive which enabled it, almost from the dawn of time, to send out horde after horde, in rapid succession, to overrun and people all the countries of Europe and Asia. It is certain that no son or grandson of Noah is anywhere expressly said to have proceeded to Tartary to colonise it; nor, beyond the text of Menu, which we have quoted in a previous chapter, which makes the *Sákás*, as well as the *Chinas*, branches of the military class of India, do we know of any statement anywhere of any other nation having gone to occupy it. In fact, till the Scythians came to be felt by actual contact, all their country was known as *Terra Incognita*, totally uninhabitable by man, and occupied only by wolves and other wild beasts; and, even after the nation came to be known, the terror with which they were regarded by the ancients peopled their country for a long time with monsters of various kinds, such as griffins and satyrs, and men having feet like horses, or only one eye on their forehead.

Our theory, we are anxious to explain it, is this, that none of the larger subdivisions of the earth were destitute of inhabitants at the time when the great migration of nations from Babel is said to have occurred; that the first population of each country, Tartary particularly included,

originated within itself; and that this original planting was, in most countries, probably largely added to afterwards, by colonisation by the more prolific nations of the globe, among whom the Tartars were most prominent. Persia and India, at all events, and in a lesser degree China also, appear to have been largely assisted with colonists in this way from the Scythic hive, which also sent out horde after horde to people the most distant extremities of Europe. Babylon, doubtless, was also another centre which at the same time sent out its nations to replenish the earth, the Mosaic history being our guarantee for this belief. But the small parties which appear to have issued thence must have been quite absorbed by the countries immediately adjoining it; and the countries which had not been inundated at all, or had only been partially depopulated by the deluge, could scarcely have stood in need of, or invited, such casual contingents.

Of the rule that swayed the Scythic people we know little till we come to the modern days of Chingez Khán; nor do we know when and how they began to form themselves into a regular government. We learn from Herodotus that one or two tribes at least acknowledged a kind of monarchy, and this is perfectly agreeable to the account we have given of them; but the sovereigns thus placed over them do not appear to have ever been allowed to wield anything like absolute power. The exercise of authority over them and confinement within fixed abodes were equally hated by the people, and they only submitted to them when they were weary with wars or overburdened with spoils. Even then the khákán never dared to be a despot; the inclination of the people had always to be consulted: and in the matter of succession to the chiefship especially, their voice was paramount. The sovereignty of the Moguls, we read, was, by the choice of the people, confined to the line of Budensir Mogak, the youngest son of Aláncu; and, similarly, Octai, the youngest son of Chingez, was chosen by them as king, or khákán, after him, in preference to his elder brothers. The laws of the

Scythians, if they had any, are unknown to us ; it is to be presumed that they had none. They had no institutions calculated to make them a great nation, nothing to give them a steady development. They only appear as robber bands, swelling out at times into enormous masses, but only for purposes of spoliation, conquest, or colonisation—collapsing again to their former size after their transitory aggrandizement, evidently by leaving behind large hordes in the countries conquered or colonised. The character given of the people by ancient historians is, on the whole, a favourable one. Its chief traits are said to have been temperance, hospitality, contempt of riches, and generosity,—a few tribes only being distinguished by great fierceness and cruelty. Originally, their religion consisted of the pure adoration of one God ; but this soon became extinct, upon which they adopted the worship of a plurality of gods, to whom, however, they neither built temples nor reared statues. They only planted spacious groves in honour of them, in which beasts, and sometimes human victims, were sacrificed. Of literature and the arts they knew nothing. The only art they cultivated was that of war ; and their only manufactures comprised the building of waggons for their families and luggage, and the tanning and dressing the skins of beasts for covering them. They also fabricated their own martial weapons. Reading and writing were unknown to them ; even in comparatively modern times the magnificent Chingez Khán had no officer who could write.

CHAPTER VI.

PHŒNICIA, SYRIA, PALESTINE, AND ARABIA.

Phœnicia.

THE name of Phœnicia, or Phœnice, is derived by the Greeks from Phœnix, who, they say, was its second king; while the Hebrews pretend that it is a translation of the word Edom, the Edomites having fled to that country in the days of David. In point of fact, however, the Phœnicians seem to have a much remoter antiquity than either of the above derivations would allow, for Sanchoniatho, who inquired into their antiquities, traces their history from the beginning of the world. Barring its rocky coast, the soil of the country was good and productive, its air wholesome, and its climate agreeable. It was throughout plentifully watered by small rivers, several of which overflowed during the rains. Its people, however derived, appear to have intermixed largely with the Canaanites from the earliest times; and their language, certainly, was a dialect of the Hebrew. They were much famed for their arts, sciences, and manufactures,—the most prominent among the last of which were the glass of Sidon, the purple of Tyre, and the exceeding fine linen they wove; but what they were most famous for was their knowledge of navigation, which gave them a position almost singular among the nations of the age. They presented the most marked instance in ancient history of the aggrandizement of a nation by their commerce, and of their wide expansion by peaceful colonisation.

The first pair of mortals in Phœnicia, according to Sanchoniatho, were Protogonus and Æon, both begotten of the wind Colpias by his wife Baau, or Baut. Of Æon it

is said that she was the first to find out the way of taking food from trees, which has been very unnecessarily assumed to refer to the legend of Eve having first eaten of the forbidden fruit. The issue of these first parents were called Genus and Genea, who adored the sun under the name of Baël-Samen, and named their offspring Phos, Phur, and Phlox—that is, light, fire, and flame. The next generation of men were giants, and lived on mountains; their women are said to have been exceedingly immoral, “who without shame lay with any man they could light upon.” In the fifth generation was born Hypsuranius, who made a raft of ploughs, and was so bold as to venture out on it into the sea; while his brother Usöüs constructed the first boat from the trunk of a tree. From this time forward navigation became the especial avocation of the race, though the first complete ship was not built till the time of the Cabiri, the children of Sydyk, who belonged to the twelfth generation. Intermediately, were born in succession hunters, fishermen, forgers in iron, brick-makers, husbandmen, herdsmen, and men who taught the people to constitute villages. One of the kings of the ninth generation, named Agrouerus, was the patron of husbandry; and after him the husbandman class went by the same name, which, curiously enough, corresponds very nearly with the word *Agoori*, which is used in the same sense by the Hindus. In the tenth generation was born Uranus, the son of Eluin; and in the eleventh, Misor, who discovered the use of salt, and begat Taaustus, or Hermes, who invented letters. Cronus, the son of Uranus, who was also of the eleventh generation, having rebelled against his father, drove him out of the kingdom and usurped the throne. One of his brothers, Dagon, discovered bread-corn; two others were named Betylus and Atlas. Contemporary with these were Pontus and Typhon, with whom Cronus made war. The city of Byblus, the first city of Phœnicia, was built by Cronus. With his consent, his sister-wife, Astarté, reigned over the whole country; and, in going about the world, he also dis-

tributed what had never belonged to him, giving to his daughter Athena the kingdom of Attica in Greece, and to his friend Taautus, or Hermes, the whole of Egypt. In a later age these stories were allegorized, and the first kings of Phœnicia came in time to be worshipped as gods.

The history of the country, as told by the Greeks, makes Agenor, the son of Neptune, its first king. He was succeeded by his son Phœnix, from whom the name of the country was derived. The next king, after a long interval, was Phalis, who flourished in the time of the Trojan war, and fought on the side of the Greeks. After him the records are silent again, and we are obliged to turn to the Hebrew account where it takes up the narrative. This starts by asserting that Phœnicia, even in the earliest times, did not exist as a single empire, but was only a knot of several states, each of which had a distinct king and government, though all acted in concert in carrying out great schemes of national aggrandizement. The principal of these states were Sidon, Tyre, and Aradus; and of these Tyre was at one time the most powerful.

Sidon, the first-mentioned state, was founded in B.C. 598, by a person bearing the same name, and said to be of the line of Canaan. The next king spoken of is Tetramnestus, who reigned in B.C. 481, and assisted Xerxes in his expedition against Greece. Another king, Teunes, is mentioned, who ruled when Darius Ochus occupied the Persian throne. He is said to have assisted Nectabanus, king of Egypt, in his attempt to shake off the yoke of Persia, which drew down upon him the anger of the Persian king, the result of which was that Teunes, after much degradation and perfidy on his part, was killed, and all Phœnicia brought temporarily under the Persian yoke. In the reign of Strato (B.C. 333), Sidon, freeing herself from Persia, submitted to Alexander, upon which Strato, who had opposed the movement, was deprived of his crown, which was conferred on a poor man named Ballonymus, who was found working in a garden as a common labourer.

The appointment of one of themselves as king was received by the people with great joy, and Ballonymus remained faithful to the last, both to his countrymen and to the Macedonians.

The first king of Tyre, by the Hebrew account, was Abihal, who reigned in B.C. 1056, and was contemporary with David, and probably arrayed against him. He was succeeded by his son Hiram, who maintained a close friendship with David, and assisted Solomon in building the temple of the Lord, and in equipping his fleets, and also gave him a daughter in marriage. Hiram was succeeded by his son Baleazar, who was followed by some princes whose reigns were only distinguished by assassinations and usurpations. In B.C. 962, Ithobal, the chief priest of Astarté, was raised to the throne. He is spoken of as both king of Tyre and Sidon, from which it would appear that Sidon was subject to Tyre long before she assumed a distinct existence. The next king, after two intermediate reigns, was Pygmalion, in whose reign his widowed sister Elishá, otherwise called Dido, is said to have fled from Tyre and established herself in Carthage, on the coast of Africa, to prevent her brother from seizing on the immense riches which were left to her by her husband. In the reign of Elulæus (B.C. 717), Tyre became involved in a war with the Assyrians, and was besieged; but held out for five years, after which the siege was raised. Nebuchadnezzar again laid siege to the city in B.C. 585, and took it after thirteen years, in B.C. 572, when unable to get at the wealth of the Tyrians, he razed their capital to the ground. The royal post was now abolished, and Tyre was for a few years governed by a board of judges. The kings who succeeded were all tributaries to the Assyrians, and after them to the Persians; and one of them, Marten, served in the navy of Xerxes, against the Greeks. The people of Tyre in the meantime devoted themselves with great spirit and perseverance to the erection of a new city in place of their old one, and this had a long era of peace to mature the greatness it attained.

In the reign of Azelmic, in B.C. 333, the new city was besieged by Alexander the Great, on admittance into it having been refused to him; and, being taken in seven months, it was burnt to the ground, and the inhabitants either destroyed or enslaved.

The history of Aradus is but very slightly known, the name of three kings only having come down to us—viz., Arbal; his son Narbal, who served in the Persian fleet under Xerxes, against the Greeks; and Gerostratus, who served under Darius Codomanus against Alexander, but soon found it to his interest to make his submission to the Macedonian.

The account of Sanchoniatho, which we have noticed, does not in any way allude to the deluge, which seems to have swept over all the countries in the immediate neighbourhood of Phœnicia. The ecclesiastical writers conclude from this that the Phœnician records must have been tampered with, at least to the extent implied by the omission, though the object of so corrupting them is not clearly explained. They attribute the act to an anxiety on the part of the Phœnician historians to conceal all evidence of the great judgment which overtook the race of Cain; but they do not say why it should have become necessary to conceal such evidence at all. They next go on, by manipulations of divers kinds—such as the rearrangement of generations and the conversion of names—to make the rest of the Phœnician version accord with what is stated in the Hebrew records, being unwilling, apparently, to allow two dissimilar accounts to stand in regard to one of the very centres of Judaism. This patchwork, however, has not satisfied all parties; and the bolder commentators find it safer altogether to reject the history of Sanchoniatho as idle conjecture. The age and authority of that writer, however, must always command respect; and his evidence on some points at least is of very great value. It goes to establish, first, that, like China, Assyria, Egypt, and other countries, Phœnicia also had a set of first parents exclusively her own, by whom the country was peopled; and

secondly, that the country was not visited by the flood,—both points of great importance as regards our present inquiry. In time, Phœnicia does appear to have been colonised by the Canaanites and others; but there was apparently full and sufficient previous peopling of it from within.

The history of the early civilisation of the Phœnicians is well known—their days of greatest glory being those of Solomon, when they engrossed all the trade of the world. They made some remarkable voyages in the service of that king himself, and one long voyage all round Africa in the service of Necho II. of Egypt. Their position as merchants and navigators was simply this: The products of all Asia came to their country for further transport westward; but the sea intervened, and a seafaring people only could pass on the trade further. The benefit to them was too great to be overlooked, and they took advantage of the necessity of their position to become the best mariners of the ancient world. But something more was wanted. What England found out in a subsequent age in extending her trade to India, Phœnicia discovered in her day—namely, that the development of trade needed the protection of settlements; and settlements were accordingly established by them all along the shores of the Mediterranean, in the Euxine and the Baltic Seas, and even in the Persian Gulf—by force, where force was found necessary, but without resort to it where it was not absolutely required. The islands of Cyprus, Sicily, and the Balearics, also belonged to them. But they betrayed no thirst for conquest in the excitement which led them on. They avoided contests with other powers, and retired from the coasts of the *Ægean* Sea and from Sicily before the Greeks, risking the opprobrium of weakness and cowardice rather than entangle themselves with what would have impaired their usefulness. No nation of the ancient world did greater service to the cause of civilisation. They carried it with them—that is, such civilisation as then existed—wherever they went, teaching many things, and,

among others, the use of letters, to the savages of Europe, at least fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ. Embarking from the Red Sea, they sailed round Africa by doubling the Cape of Good Hope; while, piercing through the Pillars of Hercules, they visited the coast of Britain, and even the shores of the Baltic. The most remarkable of their colonies was Carthage, which soon grew as powerful as the mother state, and was then cheerfully given up. This affords one of the most interesting spectacles that the history of the world affords.

Syria.

Syria was named after Cyrus, the son of Agenor; but the Hebrews called it Aram, after the youngest son of Shem. Authors are not agreed as to the exact bounds of this country, which differed very much at different times, being more or less extensive as it became more or less famous. One thing is certain, that, like Phœnicia, it was originally composed of distinct states, which again had different names at different times. The country was mostly a level campaign, and the soil of it was exceedingly fertile, the whole having always been regarded as a pleasant garden, abounding in all things required for the comfort and convenience of man. Of remarkable peculiarities, the famous cedars of Lebanon belonged to it, and also the magnificent ruins of Baalbeck and Palmyra, which were the halting-places of the extensive commerce that was carried on through the country in ancient times.

The very ancient history of Syria is not well known. The principal states into which it was divided were Zobah, Damascus, Hamath, and Geshur. The first king of Zobah whose name has come down to us was Rehob. His son, Hadadezer, was contemporaneous with David, and was remarkable for his unfortunate wars with him. The kingdom of Zobah being overthrown by David, that of Damascus rose upon its ruins. Rezon, who had served under Hadadezer and deserted him, founded this new

state, and proved a troublesome enemy to Solomon. Some of his successors followed the same course. Benhadad I., in particular, took away several provinces from Israel. His son, Benhadad II., was distinguished for the service he rendered to Damascus by adorning it with several fine structures; but his wars with the Israelites always turned out to be most unfortunate to himself. Hazael, his murderer, who succeeded him, had better fortune, proving a scourge in the hands of God to chastise the Jews, while he elevated Syria to the height of its glory. The hostility towards the Jews was continued by Benhadad III. and Rezin, till Ahaz, king of Judah, prevailed on Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, to attack Damascus, which led to the empire of the ancient Syrians being subverted, in B.C. 740.

Of the other states, Hamath and Geshur, the accounts are still more imperfect. The first king of Hamath was Toi, who had to fight hard with Hadadezer, king of Zobah, for his independence; and when the pride of Zobah was humbled by David, Toi became tributary to his throne. In after-times, Hamath became subject to the kings of Damascus; and, when Damascus itself was reduced by Assyria, Hamath also fell before the arms of Sennácherib and Esarhaddon. Of the kings of Geshur, the first name known is that of Ammihud, who was succeeded by Talmi, whose daughter Maacha was the wife of David, and the mother of Absalom. Geshur always maintained a firm alliance with the family of David, and afterwards became subject to Damascus, till it finally came under the Assyrian yoke with the rest of Syria.

The history of Syria does not call for any special note. It seems to have been colonised immediately after the deluge, mainly by the Aramites, and also by the Canaanites—the Syrians being thus descended partly from Shem and partly from Ham, which places them quite on a level with most of the ancient nations in point of antiquity. Their government originally was by heads of families, who were called kings, of whom there was a great number; but it is

not known by what laws or civil regulations the administration was conducted. The character of the people was, from the earliest times, exceedingly effeminate; but their learning and arts were always much prized. In common with the Phœnicians, they shared the credit of having first invented letters. Their religion was gross idolatry, represented by the most obscene images. Their civilisation was best represented by their trade, which was very extensive both by land and water.

Palestine.

Palestine was originally called the land of Canaan, after the son of Ham, who peopled it. Canaan had eleven sons each the father of a tribe or nation; but seven of these nations only dwelt in this land. These were subdivided into several little kingdoms, all of which laboured under the evil influence of the curse pronounced by Noah against Ham, which doomed them to subjection and final extermination. The country was one of the finest and most fertile in the world. The Bible describes it as a land flowing with milk and honey—a land of brooks and waters, and of fountains and depths springing out of the hills and valleys—a land of wheat and barley, of wines, figs, and pomegranates—whose stones were iron, and out of whose mountains were dug out brass. The corn produced in it was most plentiful, and of the most excellent kind; its fruits were delicious and in great request; its pasture-grounds were most fertile. This was the land which Abraham was called out of his native country to occupy, and from which his descendants were at last expelled for their ingratitude, vice, and apostasy.

Abraham was the son of Teráh, and tenth in descent from Noah. He was born in Ur of the Chaldees, where he dwelt till the death of his father, when, having become anxious to escape the idolatrous pollutions around him, he was commanded by God to depart to another land, where he was to be blessed and multiplied, so that in his seed the

nations of the earth might be blessed.* The inhabitants of Chaldea were, at this time, to a great extent nomadic and wandering in their habits, like the Tartars and the Arabs; and the patriarch of the Jewish race appears to have partaken of this character. He started for his new home in B.C. 1921; but there was a famine in Canaan shortly after, and this induced him to visit Egypt, where he lent his wife to the king, pretending that she was his sister, for which weakness he was rebuked and sent away. Returning to Canaan, he settled in it in B.C. 1920, and was in time succeeded by his son Isaac, and he by his younger son Jacob. Up to this time the history of the Jews is only that of one nomad family. Jacob, we read, had twelve sons, from whom sprang the twelve tribes of Israel—that is, the nomad family having increased to a nation, had now to be divided into tribes. One of these sons, Joseph, being best beloved by the father, was, by the jealousy of his brothers, sold into bondage, and carried by those who bought him into Egypt. He there found favour with the king, and became his favourite minister; and when there was a great famine, after seven years of plenty, he brought over all his family (the whole tribe of Israel apparently) into Egypt, in B.C. 1706, having provided himself with ample stores beforehand for the occasion. Here the Israelites dwelt for two hundred and sixteen years, and increased in numbers so rapidly that the Egyptians began to grow jealous of them; while a new dynasty of kings which “knew not Joseph” regarded with disquiet their strange customs, and wished to force them to blend and mingle with the people of the country, and build houses and inhabit cities. This the Jews resisted, being unac-

* “The Lord had said unto him—Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.”—Gen. xii. 1-3.

customed to such restrictions; and their bondage was thus much embittered, till, by the interposition of Heaven, and under the guidance of Moses, they finally obtained liberation, in B.C. 1491, and fled over to Arabia, the Red Sea drying up to give them a safe passage. A temporary recession of waters from tidal causes would not alone have sufficed for such retreat; the slime at the bottom of the sea must at the same time have been miraculously hardened. The nomad habits of the people being still strong, they wandered about for forty years in the wastes of Arabia, during which period Moses established amongst them a system of laws and the worship of one God, notwithstanding that they were surrounded by idolatrous nations on all sides. In B.C. 1451, Moses died, after having led them to the borders of Canaan, upon which the lead of the nation was assumed by Joshua, who conducted them to their resting-place. The fact is, they had got quite weary of their wanderings, and were not unwilling now to adopt the civilised line of life that was pointed out to them. The land of Canaan was conquered by them in six years, a rain of hailstones of large size falling upon the Canaanites, so that many more died therefrom than by the sword.

After the conquest of Palestine, the Israelites, for four hundred years, continued to be governed as a feudal republic, by their high-priests and judges. Each tribe still preserved its own patriarch or elder, as in the nomad state; and the judges and the high-priests only held the whole nation together by the one common bond that subsisted between them in the worship of Jehovah. In time, however, this bond ceased to be strong enough to keep things straight, and then arose the cry for a king; when the prophet Samuel, under divine direction, chose Saul, the son of Kish, who became the first king, in B.C. 1095. Saul was succeeded by David, the son of Jesse, a warlike prince, under whom the nation, hitherto pastoral, began to assume a martial character. The whole constitution of the government was now changed, and a political status assumed; and Jerusalem, having been fortified and em-

bellished, now became the chief city and sanctuary of the Jews. But the reign of David was not a happy one to himself. He sowed the seed of crime by his adultery with the wife of Uriah the Hittite, and his children followed in his wake; and there were incest, assassination, and rebellion in the family to disturb his felicity, till he died in B.C. 1015, broken down by wars, cares, and vexation. His son Solomon, who succeeded him, had a peaceful and brilliant reign. It is said that God appeared to him in a dream, and promised to grant him whatever he should ask for; and that he only wanted such a degree of wisdom as would enable him to govern with prudence and sagacity. In his time the nation reached the highest state of prosperity and civilisation, and he built the temple of Jerusalem and equipped a navy; besides which he also built the cities of Baalbeck and Palmyra in Syria, as store-houses for facilitating the commerce carried on by the Phœnicians. But the rule of the sovereign had already ceased to be vigorous, internal decay in the constitution had made its appearance, and even at this early stage there was an actual secession of the province of Syria by the foundation of the kingdom of Damascus.

Solomon was succeeded by his son Rehoboam, who had scarcely ascended the throne when the suppressed disaffection of the people broke out into open rebellion; and, the tribes separating, ten formed the kingdom of Israel, acknowledging Jeroboam as their king—while two formed the kingdom of Judah, remaining faithful to Rehoboam. Then comes the history of the internecine struggles between the two states, heightened by their alliances with foreign powers, till Tiglath-Pileser II., king of Assyria, after overthrowing the kingdom of Damascus, subjugated both Israel and Judah, and made them tributary. This was followed by the invasion of Sargon, in B.C. 721, when the ten tribes of Israel were carried into captivity and transplanted to Media; and in B.C. 588, Nebuchadnezzar imposed similar captivity on the remaining two tribes of Judah. After this, when Babylon in its turn was over-

turned by Cyrus, the Jews were permitted by him to return to Palestine, holding it in subjection to Persia; and upon the downfall of Persia, they became subject, first, to Alexander and his successors, and then, after a short interval of independence, to the Romans. It was during this subjection to Rome that Christ was born. The Jews afterwards provoked the Romans by several revolts, which led to the storming of Jerusalem by Titus, in A.D. 72, and to the dispersion of the nation throughout the world.

The Bible gives the history of the Jews in detail, and the account is quite complete. The history is that of a very insignificant people, and is remarkable only for the great personal interest evinced by Providence on their behalf. The laws given to them being divine, were faultless; but they do not seem to have succeeded in keeping the people away from vice and ingratitude. Next to the constant interference of God in their favour, the most noticeable circumstance in the account is their constant defection from Him. Their general civilisation was neither greater nor less than that of the surrounding nations of the age. Had they been able to act up to the law that was given to them, it would doubtless have been more remarkable.

Arabia.

Jezirat-al-Árab, or the peninsula of the Arabs, is the designation by which Arabia is best known to its own inhabitants; but the name of Arabáh, given to it from remote antiquity, is also recognised. The country is divided into three parts named respectively, Arabia Petræa, Arabia Deserta, and Arabia Felix. It has several lofty ranges of mountains; but by far the greater part of it consists of level, sandy, and arid plains. The division called Arabia Petræa embraces the north-western, and that called Arabia Deserta the north-eastern portion of the country, all the rest of it being included in the division named Arabia Felix. Almost the whole of the northern part of the

peninsula is thus a lonesome and desolate wilderness, no otherwise diversified than either by plains covered with sand, or by mountains consisting of naked rocks and precipices; and to this dreary country the heavens give no rain, except at the time of the equinoxes. Throughout the deserts are large mountains of sand, formed by the violence of the winds which are continually blowing over them; but they are relieved at distant intervals by fruitful spots, called *oases* or *abases*, clothed with trees and vegetation, abounding with fruits, and watered by fountains and rivulets. Even Arabia Felix, or that portion of it which is called Yemen, or the "most happy," is not a cultivable country throughout. It has only a large number of fruitful spots, some thinly-scattered groves, and a few small, pure streams, which, contrasted with the general dreariness of the country around, perhaps justify the surname that has been given to it. Of its products, therefore, there is nothing to mention; but it has in all ages been celebrated for its breed of horses, which has nowhere been rivalled.

The division last named, which is also called Arabia Proper, is subdivided into five provinces, named Yemen, Hejáz, Tehámá, Najd, and Yemámá; to which a sixth is sometimes added—namely, Báhreïn, the maritime tract on the eastern coast lying between Bussoráh and the farthest limit of Omán. Other authorities make out the main divisions to be two only—namely, Yemen and Hejáz, the former including Báhreïn, and the latter the other provinces which have been named. The general tradition current throughout the whole of this territory is that Yuktán, the son of Eber, first settled in it with his family and was raised to the throne; and that he left thirteen sons, of whom the first, Yarab, succeeded him at Yemen, while the second, Joram, founded a separate kingdom for himself in Hejáz. After this, Ishmael and his mother Hagar, being cast forth by Abraham, came and settled in the wilderness of Páran; and Ishmael, having married a daughter of the line of Joram, left an issue of twelve sons. The present

Arabs accordingly derive their descent from two stocks—namely, (1) that originating with Yuktán, whose posterity are called “Al Árab al Áribá,” or the genuine and pure Arabs; and (2) that originating with Ádnan, a descendant of Ishmael, whose issue are named “Al Árab al Mostárebá,” or the naturalized Arabs.

The province of Yemen was ruled over by the successors of Yuktán continuously to the time of Mahomet, with the exception of an interval of seventy-two years, during which it was held by the Ethiopians. The account given of the kings is, however, very imperfect; and of most of them we know nothing beyond their names. The title of the dynasty soon came to be changed to that of Hámyár, after the prince fourth in succession to Yuktán—the total number of kings belonging to it being forty-five, excluding four who were Ethiopians and five who were nominees of the Persians. The fifteenth prince, Al-Háreth, has the reputation of having greatly enriched his kingdom, for which service the title of Tobbá (one who is followed) was conferred on him—a surname which was afterwards generally adopted by all his successors. The nineteenth king, Dhu'l Adhaar Amru, was a great warrior, and received the surname of Lord of Terrors, from his subjects having got terrified at the sight of the captives brought by him from the wars. He was eventually expelled by his own people for some enormity not named. The twenty-second ruler was, according to several authorities, a female, named Belkis, whom they assert to be the same as the queen of Sheba, who had an interview with Solomon. The twenty-fourth prince was Shamer Yuraash, who is said to have carried his arms through Persia into Tartary, where he built the city of Samarkand. The thirty-second king, Abu Carb Ásaad, has the credit of having embellished the Caabá, or quadrangular edifice in Meccá—though who erected it, or for what purpose, is not known, tradition attributing its construction to Abraham and Ishmael at random. Abu Carb afterwards introduced Judaism in Yemen, upon which his people rose up against him and killed him. The forty-

second prince, Dhu Shánater, is remembered only for the circumstance of having six fingers on each hand, and for his bestial lust, for which he was dethroned. His successor, Yusef Dhu Nowas was a great promoter of Judaism, and put many people to death by various tortures for refusing to embrace it. The forty-fourth prince was Dhu Jádán, a bigoted Jew, who treated his Christian subjects with such barbarity that they applied for protection to Eleshaas, king of Ethiopia, who attacked Yemen and conquered it, and, after establishing the Christian religion in it, placed an Ethiopian, Aryát, on the throne. The reign of Aryát's son, Abrahá Ebn al Sábáh, was much disturbed by differences between the Christians and the Koreish, who were the custodians of the Caabá; and the king, having taken the side of the former, was slain. The last of the Ethiopian princes was Masruk, who was expelled from the throne by Seif Ebn Dhu Yazan, a prince of the Hámyár family, with the aid of Noshirwán, king of Persia. After Dhu Yazan, five princes were successively elected by the Persians to reign in Yemen, till it fell into the hands of Mahomet, the last prince, Bazan, embracing the new creed.

We have not disturbed the above narrative to state that, at about the time of Alexander the Great, a heavy calamity befell the tribes settled in Yemen by the overflow of the Arem, which forced eight tribes to abandon their dwellings and found the two kingdoms of Hirá and Ghássan. The kingdom of Hirá was founded by Málec, who was descended from Cáhlan, one of the brothers of Hámyár. It was situated out of the proper limits of Arabia, in Chaldea or Irak, and was therefore, nominally at least, dependent on Persia. Twenty-four princes reigned over it till the time of Abubekr, when the last king, Al Maghrur, was defeated and killed by Wálid, and the kingdom annexed to the Káliphat. The kingdom of Ghássan was founded by the tribe of Azd, under the lead of a chief named Jáfnáh Ebn Amru. The site selected for it was also beyond the limits of Arabia, in Syria Damsená. Thirty-one princes reigned over it till the time of Kaliph Omár, who subdued it along

with the rest of Syria, and annexed it to the Mahomedan empire.

We now turn to the separate kingdom of Hejáz, which, we have said, was founded by Joram, the second son of Yoktán. This kingdom continued in his line only up to the time of Ishmael, who, having married in the house of Joram, the Joramites—it is said, of their own accord, but more probably under pressure—gave up the sovereignty to their nephew Kidar, a son of Ishmael, who became the fourteenth prince of the country. The successors of Kidar, however, were not able to retain the kingly power long, and the government of the country soon came to be divided among the heads of the several tribes settled in it. At Meccá, an aristocracy was founded by the tribe of the Koreish, who retained all authority in their hands till the time of Mahomet. The Arabs of Arabia Petraea and Arabia Deserta were all along ruled by their own chiefs.

The second section of Arabian history commences with the advent of Mahomet, who was born in Meccá, and belonged to the tribe of the Koreish. His doctrine of one God, of whom he was the only Prophet, was at first received with so much opposition by his own tribe, that he was compelled to fly from Meccá—which constitutes the Hejirá, or flight, and is dated A.D. 622. It was better received in Mediná, where he obtained much material support, and whence he was able to force the whole of Arabia to acknowledge his mission. The temporal sovereignty of Arabia went along with this great religious innovation; and, after the death of the Prophet, the Káliphat succeeded both to his spiritual and secular powers, which were equally extended in every direction by the one unanswerable argument of force—"death, tribute, or the Korán." Even a violent internal schism, which continues in force to this day—namely, whether the first three Kaliphs had any legitimate right to the rank which was assumed by them, as is maintained by the Soonis and denied by the Sheáhs—did not impede to any extent the

progress of conquest and conversion. The first countries taken were Syria and Palestine ; others followed in rapid succession ; till, within a period of seventy years, the sway of the Mahomedans extended on one side over Persia and Turkestan, and on the other over Africa and Spain. The political authority of the Kaliphs did not decline till after the reign of Haroun-al-Rashid, or Haroun the Just, the contemporary of Charlemagne.

Arabia has no history of the age before the flood, unless particulars in regard to it should be found in the inscriptions discovered on its rocks and mountains, which have not yet been deciphered. After the flood, its general history commences with the settlement of Yuktán and his family in Yemen, to which we have referred ; though some of the descendants of Cush may have fixed themselves earlier in that part of Arabia Petræa which borders on Egypt. Be that as it may, from the earliest times the Arabs seem to have intermixed mostly with the Hebrews ; and the affinity between their languages indicates that the two races were of a kindred stem. Like the Hebrews, also, the Arabs long led a pastoral and predatory life, which latter feature has remained with several tribes up to the present day ; and for this reason they were little heard of for ages by other nations. The dreariness of their country too, protected them from the inquisitiveness and aggression of foreign powers ; and, though there were times when Arabia was overrun by the Persians and the Romans, no attempt was ever made by any invader or conqueror to hold it long, or to have anything to do with it beyond keeping up an occasional settlement on its borders. It thus came in all ages to be regarded as the sanctuary of the free and the brave, and the Arabs were deemed to be a powerful people more than six hundred years before the age of David ; though of the hardihood of its inhabitants, their immediate neighbours, the ancient Persians and others, did not entertain a very high opinion.

The people of Arabia were divided into two classes, namely, the wandering Arabs or Bedouins, and those that dwelt in cities and towns. The great difference between the former and the Tartars was in this, that many of the Bedouins, tired of a wandering life, would collect themselves into towns and live by trade and agriculture, which the Tartars never did, except when settling in other countries and intermixing with their inhabitants. The mode of government among the two descriptions of Arabs was to a certain extent the same: their immediate superiors were the *Sheiks* and *Emirs*, the former ruling over a collection of tents or huts, and the latter over a whole tribe. Over all these the city Arabs supported the authority of a supreme magistrate, distinguished in different ages by the different names of king, grand-emir, or kaliph, who, however, never attempted to exercise any very close or despotic superintendence; but the wandering Arabs never acknowledged any such authority. The knowledge of letters among the people was very slender, and was confined to the people of Yemen. In sciences and arts the progress made even by the latter was inconsiderable; but they were fond of poetry, and, as in India, all memorable transactions amongst them were recorded in verse. The chief accomplishments prized throughout the country were horsemanship and martial exercises with the bow, the javelin, and the sword. In physical make the Arab is not very robust; but he is well-formed and active, and insensible to fatigue. His mind is quick, his hand always ready; and he has no property to distract his attention beside his horse and his camel. The original religion of the country was the worship of the sun and stars: this was followed by a variety of creeds, including Christianity on the one hand, and devil-worship on the other, till the doctrine of Mahomet was promulgated, and found ready acceptance among a people who fully appreciated its character of violence, and were kindled into enthusiasm by its promises of sensual felicity. Their

existence throughout, both before and after their conversion to Mahomedanism, has been characterized by one continuous course of wrong, robbery, and bloodshed. Civilisation cannot be said to have ever made much progress in the land; though, outside of Arabia, the Saracens or Moors, who were the followers of the Kaliphs of Bagdad, were, at one time, pre-eminently famous for it.

CHAPTER VII.

EGYPT.

EGYPT is named after Egyptus, one of its ancient kings; but in the language of the Egyptians themselves it was called Khemi, or Khem, whence the name of Chemistry, which was discovered in it, is derived. This country has been famous from the earliest times as the cradle of the sciences and arts, and the best known school for wisdom and politics in the western world. It has also always had the credit of being a very fertile place, though it varies greatly in its physical characteristics in different parts. The Nile, the largest river in the Old World, runs through it from south to north, flowing in one undivided stream for about three hundred and sixty miles before it branches off into two main channels in proceeding towards the sea. The soil on both banks of the river, as far as its floods extend, is extremely fertile; but, beyond that limit, on the west is a sandy desert, and on the east a chain of rocky mountains, both equally destitute of vegetation. The richest part of the country is that called *Fayoum*, or the Delta, which lies between the two main branches of the Nile and the Mediterranean, and appears to have been gradually formed by the deposits of the river. There are also certain well-watered spots, or *oases*, in the midst of the western desert, which are very productive. The climate is exceedingly dry, the heat being seldom relieved by rain; and all vegetable life would have been completely scorched but for the overflowing of the Nile at stated periods, which, besides vivifying the soil, enriches it with an excellent slimy deposit, that increases its fruitfulness. The products of the land are chiefly corn and pulses, and also a great variety of vegetables and fruits. The pastures for fattening

flocks and herds are particularly rich ; and the mildness of the air admits of the cattle being left to graze as well by night as by day.

The history of Egypt has been divided into four distinct periods, the first of which begins with the creation of the world, and extends to the conquest of the country by Cambyzes, in B.C. 525 ; the second comprises the period between the date last mentioned and the assumption of the government by the Macedonians, in B.C. 332 ; the third comprehends the rule of the Macedonian dynasty to B.C. 30, when the country became a province of the Roman Empire ; while the last, which does not concern our present inquiry, embraces all the subsequent interval up to the present time. Of these, the first period includes the entire era of native greatness, and commences, like the history of every other really ancient country, with the creation of the world. The first king, it is said, was Hephæstus, Phtah, or Vulcan ; the second, Helios, or the sun ; the third, Shu, or Agathadæmon ; the fourth, Cronus, or Saturn ; the fifth, Osiris, with whom was also associated Isis, his wife ; the sixth, Thulis ; and the seventh, Typhon, who is supposed to have perished in the flood. Of the first four the accounts are not very eventful. The fifth, Osiris, also called Dionysus, is said to have married his sister Isis, and to have reigned jointly with her for some time, till he was seized by a sudden desire to wander all over the world, on the divine errand of communicating science and dispensing benefits ; upon which, leaving the reins of government in the hands of his sister-wife, and placing her under the care and guidance of his friend Hermes, he proceeded first to Ethiopia, then to Arabia, thence eastward as far as the deserts of India, where he is said to have founded a city named Nyssa, and whence he diverged to the north-west in the direction of the springs of the Danube (Ister), returning to Egypt through Thrace and Greece. A short time after his return, Osiris had to encounter the revolt of his brother Typhon, by whom he was killed. In the meantime the flood had already set in ; but it does not appear that the destruction in Egypt was

general, notwithstanding that one oriental writer has asserted (inspired apparently by the Bible) that the waters rested over it for eleven months. The name Typhon, it has been pointed out, means a deluge; but it was probably not so understood in all places, for it occurs, as we have seen, in the history of Phœnicia without referring to any inundation in that country. Bryant understands the name to indicate the Tower of Babel! We shall not attempt to decide where the difference of opinion is so great. We read the fable in its plainest sense, and take the name to be that of a royal rival, both in Phœnicia and Egypt. The word "Toofán," however, as understood in Arabia, Persia, and India, unquestionably implies a violent tempest at sea; and when we read that Typhon in Egypt was overwhelmed in water as a punishment for his wickedness, we may take it for granted that the destruction of the royal rival there in the flood, as it occurred in that country, is referred to by the story, though other accounts mention that Typhon was defeated and slain in fight by Orus, and his body afterwards thrown into the Serbon lake. That the name of Typhon should have come to be regarded as a word of common acceptance for "tempests," throughout all the southern countries of Asia, is somewhat singular; but a tempest is not a deluge, and the restless character of both the Typhons perhaps best explains why tempests have been named after them. We would here notice, that there is undeniably a great deal of sameness between the stories of Cronus of Phœnicia and Osiris of Egypt, and that it may not be impossible that the parties referred to were identical; which will only go to establish that in those days the two countries formed part and parcel of one extensive empire.

The next dynasty of Egypt commences with the reign of Orus, the son of Osiris and Isis, and counts in succession the names of Aries or Mars, Anubis, Hercules, Apollo, Ammon, Tahuti or Thoth, Sosus, and Zeus or Jupiter. Some writers regard these princes also as antediluvians, but apparently on very indifferent grounds. The first dynasty is usually referred to as that of gods, the second as that of

demigods; but Manetho, the historian of both, takes care to explain that this only means that the rulers in those ages were men of great wisdom and goodness, who, for the inventions and institutions with which they benefited mankind, were afterwards made immortal. It is pretended that a great part of these annals are founded on inscriptions extracted from ancient pillars and other public monuments. This may or may not be the case; the accounts are not unreasonable in themselves, and do not require any laboured vindication.

The dynasty of mortal kings, as distinguished from so-called gods and demi-gods, begins with Menes, who established his monarchy in B.C. 2188, and is by some considered to be the same with Misraim, the son of Ham. The story which identifies Menes with Misraim states that, when the family of Noah was dispersed in different directions after the destruction of Babel, Ham retired to Africa and occupied the north-east part of it. On the division of their father's empire after his death, Chus, the first son of Ham, settled in Ethiopia; Misraim, the second son, in Egypt; Phut, the third, in Libya; and Canaan, the fourth, in Palestine. The kingdom of Misraim, or Menes, must have been at this time of petty dimensions; but many separate states appear to have been formed around it within a short time after, to which, perhaps, the three hundred and thirty kings subsequent to Menes belonged, whose names were read by the Egyptian priests to Herodotus. As these states came to be consolidated the country was divided into three main sections, named Upper Egypt, or Thebais, which was the most southern part; middle Egypt, or Heptánomis, so named from its being subdivided into seven districts; and Lower Egypt, including the Delta and all the rest of the country to the sea. Of these, Thebais appears to have been formed earliest; though, in the absence of a certain chronology, it is not practicable to determine in what order the different divisions were founded, and which of them were contemporaneous.

Menes was succeeded by his son Atahuti, or Athothis,

also called for his accomplishments Trismegistus, to whom many inventions are attributed, including arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, letters, magic, and the dice! He likewise cultivated the vine, and introduced various religious rites and ceremonies, and the arts of dressmaking and medicine. After Atahuti, more than fifty kings intervene before we come to Busiris I., and some seven or eight again between him and Busiris II., the founder of Thebes, which from that time became the capital of Upper Egypt. By all accounts this city was one of the noblest in the world. The Greeks and Romans who saw it during the freshness of its ruins always spoke of it in raptures; and that admiration has scarcely been mellowed by the ages which have since passed by. It was called Hecatompylus, or the city of a hundred gates; and its population, it is said, was proportionate to its extent. It was full of temples and palaces, of columns, porticos, and statues; and among the curiosities contained in it was a speaking statue, said to be of Memnon, which was still to be seen in the time of Strabo. Osymandyas, a rich and powerful king, and probably the same with Osertesens I., came after Busiris, and has the reputation of having raised many of these edifices and adorned them with sculptures and paintings. He is also said to have constructed a zodiac three hundred and sixty-five cubits in circumference by one cubit in breadth and height, all of massy gold, and to have founded the first library of which mention is made in history, inscribing on it the words, "Medicine or pharmacy of the soul." It is of this prince that Diodorus quotes the well-known inscription: "I am Osymandyas, the king of kings. He who wishes to know how great I was and where I rest, let him surpass my works." "Never," says another inscription recorded of the king, "was any little child ill-treated, or any widow afflicted by me. I never troubled a fisherman, or hindered a shepherd. There was no famine in my days; no hunger under my government."

After eight or nine successors appears the name of

Uchoreus, who made Memphis, the capital of Middle Egypt, and strongly fortified it; wherefore it came to be the usual residence of subsequent kings. This part of the country was also famous for several rare monuments, such as the obelisks, the pyramids, the labyrinth, and the lake Mœris, which have made the name of it so famous. The obelisks were, almost all of them, removed to Rome by sacrilegious hands; the pyramids still remain, but the names of those whom they were intended to commemorate have not come down to us; the labyrinth, which consisted of a magnificent pile of palaces both above and under ground, was pronounced by Herodotus, who saw it, to be more surprising than the pyramids; the lake Mœris, which has now silted up, was excavated to regulate the inundations of the Nile, and was considered by the same historian to be even superior to the labyrinth.

Of course all these works were not made in one generation. The successor of Uchoreus was Egyptus, who gave his name to the entire country. Many generations intervened between him and Mœris, or Amenemha III., by whom the lake named Mœris was excavated. But all these works were made by the native princes of Egypt. The history of the kingdom next mentions the conquest of Lower and Middle Egypt, in B.C. 2084, by the shepherd-kings, or Hyksos, whom some identify with Phœnicians, and others with Bedouin Arabs; while others, again, trace in the very name of Hyksos their derivation from the Oxus tribes of Scythia. God, says Manetho, being displeased with the Egyptians, visited them with a blast of His displeasure, and permitted an ignoble race of men, who came from the east, to invade and subdue their country, destroy their temples, and enslave their wives and children; and the Egyptians all over the country, exclusive of Thebais, submitted to their rule for about two hundred and sixty years, or till B.C. 1825, when they were expelled by Aahmes, or Amosis, king of Thebes. Abraham and Sarah, forced to fly from Canaan on account of a famine, came to Egypt within this period—*i.e.* in B.C. 1920; Joseph

came in as a slave in B.C. 1728; and Jacob in B.C. 1706: but there are no events of any greater importance in this era to notice.

The Israelites departed out of Egypt in B.C. 1491, when the king, Amenhetp, or Amenophis III., otherwise called Memnon, was, with his army, drowned in the Red Sea in attempting to pursue them. Many writers are, however, now of opinion that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was Menephtah, a later sovereign, and that it was not the Red Sea that was crossed, but the Serbonian Bog, the Hebrews having taken the northern route to reach the peninsula of Sinai. In the reign of Seti I., a successor of Amenophis, the Hyksos are said to have renewed their attacks on Egypt, till they were finally repelled by him. The mightiest of all the Egyptian kings of this period was Sestesura, or Sesostris, also named Rameses the Great, the son and successor of Seti, and one of the most distinguished conquerors of antiquity. The consequence is, that every country comes forward to claim him as its own, he being confounded on one side with Belus or Nimrod, and on another with Parusrám. He subdued Asia Minor, Persia, and India, and having crossed the Ganges, penetrated, it is said, as far as the Eastern Ocean; after which he went northward to subdue the Scythians, proceeding as far to the west as the Tanais or the Don. He also subdued Ethiopia, which he made tributary; and completely consolidated Egypt by uniting its three divisions into one kingdom. From all the accounts we have of him, he appears indeed to have been, as he proudly described himself in his inscriptions, "king of kings, and lord of lords," though, it is said that, out of pride and hardness of heart, he made the captive kings whom he conquered draw his chariot on festive occasions. The innumerable prisoners he brought from other countries seem to have assisted largely in raising the gigantic edifices of which Egypt could boast; besides which, he had many triumphal monuments erected in the different lands he passed through. It was in his reign that the Egyptians began to

migrate largely in different directions, colonising Greece and other places. He was the first Egyptian king that fitted out navies of tall ships for purposes of conquest and colonisation ; and Herodotus mentions that he had a fleet of war-galleys both in the Arabian Gulf and in the Indian Ocean. His worthiness was so generally recognised by his subjects that they honoured him next only to Osiris, who was worshipped as a god ; and yet this man, so great in all respects, when struck blind in his old age, died by his own hands !

From the time of Sesostris commenced the stagnation of the Egyptian race. The entire line of kings in Egypt is divided in history into twenty-six dynasties, after excluding the dynasties of the gods and demigods. Of the mortal kings the most notable among those we have named were : Menes, Athothis, Osertesén I., Amenemba III., Aahmes, Amenophis III., and Sesostris. Among the others who were particularly distinguished were : Proteus, regarded by the Greeks as a sea-god, who rescued Helen from the hands of Paris, and returned her to her husband when he visited Egypt on his way back from Troy ; Nilus, after whom the Nile was named ; Cheops or Khufa, and his brother Cephren or Shafra, who were hated by their subjects on account of their oppressions, but nevertheless became famous for having erected the two largest of the pyramids ; the Thothmeses I. and III., who were both great warriors, and also distinguished themselves by raising many of the buildings still standing at Kárnak ; Rampsinitus who has been called the Egyptian Solomon, for having succeeded in reorganizing the government ; and Shishak, or Sesonchosis, who is said to have conquered India, and of whom the Bible speaks as being the contemporary of Rehoboam, and as having come up against Jerusalem with twelve hundred chariots and three thousand horsemen, and robbed both the temple and the king's palace, in B.C. 970.

In B.C. 715, Sabaco, a king of Ethiopia, conquered Egypt, and after burning to death the reigning sovereign

Bokchoris, reigned over the country for eight years with justice and clemency, and then, voluntarily relinquishing the throne—in obedience, it is said, to some warnings which he believed to be divine—went back to his own kingdom. After him we read of two subsequent kings, Sethron and Tharaca, uniting their forces and proceeding to the relief of Jerusalem when it was attacked by Sennácherib. Then followed a short interregnum in the succession and a state of anarchy till B.C. 685, when there succeeded a dodecarchy, twelve of the principle noblemen dividing the kingdom between themselves. Eventually, one of the twelve, Psammetichus, defeated the rest and became sole king, but only with the aid of foreign troops, on whom he was obliged to rely.

The unity established by Psammetichus remained undisturbed in after-years. The capital of the consolidated kingdom was Memphis, but Sais in Lower Egypt became the residence of the royal family, and therefore a place of equal importance. Sais was also famous for a temple dedicated to Isis, which had the following inscription upon it: "I am whatever hath been, and is, and shall be; and no mortal hath yet perceived through the veil that shrouds me." Of the other cities of Lower Egypt, Heliopolis, or the City of the Sun, was the most famous, and contained a magnificent temple dedicated to that luminary.

The most distinguished successor of Psammetichus was Necho II., who is mentioned as Pharaoh-Necho in the Bible. In his reign the circumnavigation of Africa was undertaken and successfully accomplished by the Phœnicians in Egyptian service, who, starting from the Red Sea, returned to Egypt in three years, through the Straits of Gibraltar, thus anticipating the discovery of Diaz and Vasco de Gama by more than two thousand years. Necho also attempted to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean, and actually commenced the necessary excavations, which, however, he was not able to complete. He is further known for conquests in Syria and Palestine, which were subsequently wrested from him by Nebuchadnezzar, the

king of Babylon. The military prowess of Egypt had in fact already greatly deteriorated ; and the reign of Apries, or Hophrah, which commenced with a general rebellion of his own subjects, was closed by the conquest of the country by Nebuchadnezzar, after which there were literally "no more princes of the land of Egypt" *—Egypt becoming a province of the Persian empire, which absorbed the dominions of Nebuchadnezzar. Amasis, the successor of Apries, was tributary to the Persian king, but attempted to throw off the yoke. This brought down Cambyses to Egypt in B.C. 525, when the whole country was reduced to subjection.

The history of Egypt under the Persians is but obscurely known. The rule of Cambyses himself was mainly characterized by devastation on a large scale. After his death, Egypt received a Persian governor and paid a moderate tribute, besides some personal gifts to the sovereign, including the produce of the fisheries in Lake Moëris. But many revolts occurred subsequently, which exasperated the Persians, and led to the tribute being considerably raised. The first of these disturbances took place in the time of Darius Hystaspes, and was quelled by Xerxes. The second, which was fomented by the Athenians, happened during the reign of Artaxerxes I., and was put down by Megabyzas. The third occurred in the reign of Darius II., and, in consequence of the support given to it by the Greeks, was of longest duration. It continued from B.C. 414 to 354, during which period the Egyptians went so far as to reappoint kings of their own, seven princes in succession being raised to the throne, till the country was reconquered by Artaxerxes II.

The rule of the Persians throughout was regarded by the Egyptians with intense hatred ; and this feeling was fomented by the priests, who were particularly offended on account of the Persians treating the Egyptian gods with ridicule and contempt. Their antipathy rose to the

* Ezek. xxx. 13.

highest pitch on the bull Apis being slaughtered; and when Alexander the Great, having ended the siege of Gaza, appeared on the frontiers of Egypt, at the head of a powerful army, the people turned out in crowds to submit to him, Egypt being thereby acquired without a battle by the Greeks. From Egypt Alexander went to Libya, to visit the temple of Jupiter Ammon, where the priest assured him that he was the veritable son of Jupiter, who promised to him the empire of the world, both of which assurances were received by the hero with equal satisfaction. On his way back, Alexander settled the affairs of Egypt, the local government of which he left with Egyptians, that the country might be governed according to its ancient laws and customs, while the military command was intrusted to Macedonians. He also built the city of Alexandria, after which he turned his steps towards Persia.

Alexandria, originally meant as a military colony, soon became a place of general resort, the centre of trade, and the capital of a mighty kingdom. The inhabitants were divided into three classes—namely, Egyptians, mercenaries, and foreigners, the last, who were numerous, representing all nations that came there for traffic. In time the usual effects of a foreign government began to develop themselves in the national character. The protection of the Macedonians guaranteed to them the full enjoyment of civil welfare and religious freedom; and the people that had so often risen against the Persians, sank under it into a state of political lethargy and drowsiness.

Upon the partition of the dominions of Alexander after his death, Egypt fell to the share of Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, who became king under the name of Ptolemy I., surnamed Soter. He successfully repelled the attacks, first of Perdicas, and next of Antigonus and Demetrius, the more aspiring generals of Alexander, who aimed at grasping the whole empire as it was left by that conqueror. Ptolemy also extended his dominions by the addition of Libya, Cyrene, Phœnicia, Judea, Cœle-Syria, and Cyprus; while his rule over the Egyptians was particularly mild

and beneficent. All the arts of peace were fostered by him; he extended trade and navigation in all directions, and professed a special regard for the interests of science. His son, Ptolemy II., surnamed Philadelphus, and his grandson, Ptolemy III., surnamed Evergetes, were also excellent sovereigns, who did all they could to promote the interests of the people. In the reign of the former, Egypt became the first maritime power in the world, while both her land trade and her sea trade were extensively augmented; in the reign of the latter, apart from her mercantile character, Egypt assumed that of a conquering state, her conquests being directed partly against Asia on the western coast of Arabia, and inland as far as the borders of Bactria, and partly against the interior of Ethiopia. Great efforts were also made throughout the entire era to restore the ancient monuments of the country; and it was during this time that the devastations caused by the Persians were, so far as possible, repaired.

But the greatness of the first three Ptolemys, which established Egypt as the main seat of trade, also threw it open to the advances of effeminacy and luxury, and worked out the destruction of the kings that followed. Ptolemy IV., surnamed Philopator, was a *débauché* and a tyrant; Ptolemy V., called Epiphanes, was equally intemperate and cruel; Ptolemy VI., surnamed Philometor, fell out with his brother (Ptolemy VII.), and was only able to make up with him afterwards by dismembering his dominion and giving him a portion of it, including Cyrene, Libya, and some cities of Cyprus; Ptolemy VIII., called Lathyrus, was a king of little note—besides which, by this time, Egypt had already become a tool in the hands of the administrators of Rome. After the death of Lathyrus, the kingdom was dismembered, till Auletes, one of his illegitimate sons, was placed on the throne with the assistance of the Roman governor of Syria. Auletes left four children, of whom two, Cleopatra and Ptolemy Dionysus, were constantly at feud with each other, till the second fell

in war, upon which Cleopatra ascended the throne. But Egypt was now a dependency of the Roman empire; a Roman garrison was stationed in its capital; and Cleopatra only reigned under the protection, first, of Julius Cæsar, and afterwards of Antony; and when Antony, threatened by Octavius Cæsar, fell by his own hand, Cleopatra followed the example, and was stung to death by an asp. After this, Egypt was enrolled as a Roman province, and was governed by a Roman præfect.

The antiquity of Egypt is fully vindicated in the account we have given of it; the history of Manetho showing clearly that the country was peopled before the flood, and also that the flood did not wholly depopulate it. An Arabian historian goes further, and maintains that Egypt was planted before the creation of Adam, and that one of its first kings was Gian-Ben-Gian, who ruled over the fays or peris, and erected the pyramids. The Hebrew version may nevertheless be generally accepted, that the country was largely colonised by the children of Ham, and that no regular kingdom was formed in it till the time of Menes, who, if identified with Misraim, must have begun his reign some six hundred and fifty years after the deluge. Previous to this, however, the country must have been planted to a considerable extent during the reigns of the nine princes commencing with Orus, the son of Osiris; particularly if we allow, what seems most probable, that a large portion of the old population was saved with Orus from the flood.

Of the very early civilisation of the country, the stories given contain ample evidence. Osiris travelled all over the world before the flood. He went to India, to the sources of the Danube, and to Thrace. This establishes not only that Egypt was then already well-peopled, but that the countries which were visited by Osiris were also in similar condition. Even if the story of Osiris be rejected as entirely fabulous, which probably it is not, the invasions of India by large armies, under Sesostris before the Trojan war, and under Shishak at a later date; the constant

intercourse of Egypt with Arabia from the time of the shepherd-kings, if not from an earlier period ; the doubling of the Cape of Good Hope more than two thousand years before the era of Diaz—are all undeniable proofs that the countries of the ancient world were vitally active much earlier than we generally imagine, and that the different nations intermixed more freely with each other than we give them credit for.

That the civilisation of ancient Egypt displayed itself early in architecture, the account we have given has already indicated ; and the whole country still offers existing proofs of it in the extensive remains to be seen of its pyramids, temples, and tombs. But this was not the only way in which the Egyptians distinguished themselves. They were the first people, at least in the western world, to frame definite rules of government, and a code of customs almost peculiar to themselves. The government was an absolute monarchy, but qualified by laws to which the kings, as well as the people, were obliged to conform. Everything did not depend on the arbitrary will of the sovereign ; that will had limits which were precisely defined, and which could not be overridden : and a salutary rule existed by which, after the death of a king, his vices and virtues were publicly discussed before judges who had the power of prohibiting an honourable funeral in the case of those who had not acted well, which always served as a lesson and warning to their successors. Unfortunately, as in India, all the laws and regulations were religious ordinances, which did not admit of improvement, and which could not be departed from even when they had outlived the age for which they were especially made. Some of them were, besides, very peculiar—as, for instance, that sanctioning the marriage of brother and sister, which was founded on the precedent of Osiris and Isis, the union in which case was accounted to have been particularly happy. The law stood its ground through all ages so long as it remained in force ; and, even after it had ceased to be operative, the precedent was followed by the Ptolemys,

though they did not in other matters adhere to the old *régime*.

The religion of Egypt was idolatry, which latterly, at least, became very offensive and obscene ; and the priests, as in India, formed a distinct and powerful order, which enabled them to rivet the chains of bigotry and superstition more strongly on the people, particularly as the king was always a priest. The peculiarity of the religion consisted in this, that it enjoined the worship of symbols and enigmas, and of birds and beasts ; and the worship was accompanied by many rites and ceremonies, of which exact counterparts are still traceable in India. It is with reference to this religion that Plutarch asserted that the Egyptians admitted nothing into their worship without a reason ; that nothing in it was merely fabulous or merely superstitious ; that all their institutions had reference either to morals or to what was useful in life ; and that many of them had reference to, or a resemblance of, historical facts and occurrences. There may be a great deal of truth in all this, and the remarks are not only applicable to the religion of Egypt, but also to that of India ; but, unfortunately, the hidden meaning intended to be conveyed by the rites and ceremonies enjoined was often impenetrable, while the ostensible meaning was not only easily understood, but was of such character as to chime best with the feelings and aspirations of the popular mind ; and this gave rise to all the confusion of images and ideas that is observable in India to the present day.

The people of Egypt were also divided into castes, like those of India ; but, unlike the state of things in the latter country, the barriers of caste were not held impassable in the former, and no trade or profession was reckoned to be unworthy or ignoble. This accounts for the great skill which was attained by the Egyptians in architecture, mechanics, painting, and sculpture. The profession of arms was held by them in particular esteem, notwithstanding which they never became a warlike race, even though they were able to produce such illustrious conquerors as

Thothmes III., Sesostris, and Shishak. This has been attributed to the influence of the priesthood. It was perhaps more justly ascribable to the fruitfulness of the country and the fondness of the people for all kinds of pleasure, which, as in India also, necessarily produced an extreme degree of effeminacy. Against this inference is to be recorded the testimony of Herodotus, who, in a large battle-field, observed that, while the skulls of the Persians could be easily pierced, those of the Egyptians were harder than the stones they were mixed with. But this, perhaps, is no conclusive evidence on one side or the other.

In all other respects, the success of the Egyptians was unquestionable. Their writing was of three different kinds—epistolary, sacerdotal, and hieroglyphical; the last representing ideas by figures, an ingenuity which was known likewise to the Chinese, and partially to the Hindus, Persians, and Scythians. The Egyptian writing was usually on long rolls of paper, and by means of a frayed reed, such as is used to this day in India. Great progress was made by the people in philosophy, mensuration, geometry, and arithmetic. Of magic, they knew the whole art; and the books of Trismegistus on the subject were famous throughout the ancient world. One curious art was known to them, of which no other nation was cognizant—namely, embalment, by which dead bodies were preserved for several thousands of years without decay.

By its geography Egypt is part and parcel of Africa; but from the earliest times its connection was most intimate with the countries of Asia. The resemblance between the Egyptians and the Hindus was particularly great. The religions of both nations, we have remarked, were very similar; the wildest stories in them agreed; the fight of Osiris and Typhon finds an exact counterpart in that of Bruhmá and Vishnu—and similar coincidences are constant. The agreements in proper names are also striking—more so than any observable among other nations. The habits and customs, too, of the two peoples,

were greatly accordant. The generally accepted inference from all this is, that one nation was derived from the other. The theory of Sir William Jones on this subject has already been referred to. He did not perceive any traces in Egypt of the manners, arts, and sciences prevailing in the countries which surround it, and concluded that Egypt was not peopled from any of them, but from India—probably by the first navigators of the Indian Ocean. He especially referred to the race named Sanganians, who dwelt near the mouths of the Indus, who, he inferred, had landed in Arabia or Africa in one of their piratical expeditions, and thence rambled over to Egypt. These, he says, acquired the name of Egyptians or Gypsies, and subsequently spread themselves from Egypt to Italy and other places, where they were known as Zingároes—a name nearly corresponding with their original designation of Sanganians. The idea is so circumstantially supported that it almost carries with it an air of correctness. But actually it is not worth much. Egypt was peopled quite as early as India itself. The Sanganians may have rambled over to it in the way described, but if such outskirts of India as the mouths of the Indus were then well-peopled, it must have been at an age when the whole of Egypt had been thoroughly planted. From their constant intercourse with each other, the two nations mutually borrowed all that we find common to both; but there is not a tittle of evidence to support the theory that one nation was descended, directly or indirectly, from the other.

CHAPTER VIII.

GREECE.

GREECE is so called from Græcus, the son of Thessalus, who gave his name to Thessaly. But the designation by which the country was most anciently known was Ionia, derived by the Greeks from Ion, the son of Xuthus and Creusa, the daughter of Erichtheus; and by Josephus from Javan, the son of Japheth, the son of Noah. Geographically, it is divided into two parts, the northern of which is comprised within the continent, while the southern forms a peninsula by itself, the connecting link between them being a slip of land known as the Isthmus of Corinth. In the north of the country are the Cambunian mountains; and the rest of it is also sprinkled with high rocks and hills. The principal rivers are the Peneus and the Achelous, the former of which empties itself in the *Ægean*, and the latter in the Ionian Sea. The climate has at all times been generally regarded as mild and serene, except of *Bœotia*, the air of which is thick and foggy. The soil is various, being hard and barren in some places and soft in others, which gives the country the advantage of every description of produce being cultivated in it with success. Its celebrity for woollen and linen manufactures goes as far back as the age of Homer; while, in later times, it also became well known for its productions in silk—that is, after it had stolen the secret both of the insect and its culture from eastern lands. The commercial advantages of its position were great, and early appreciated. It is washed on three sides by the sea; and the coast, all along, is indented with commodious ports and havens.

This country was anciently constituted by the federation of a number of small states, which Josephus says were

planted by the sons of Javan, but which appear to have had a prior population of indigenous growth, supplemented probably by early batches of colonists from Egypt and Phœnicia. The principal of these states were Sicyon, Argos, Attica, Bœotia, Arcadia, Thessaly, Phocis, Corinth, and Sparta; Macedon being added to their number on a later date. The other states, which made a less important figure in history, were Elis, Ætolia, Locris, Doris, and Achaia. All these were not formed at one time; their regular formation into states was gradual, and the result of the immigration of different parties of colonists at different eras. The first inhabitants were known by the name of the Pelasgi, and were by all accounts excessively savage and rude, being probably a mixture of the old original races of the country with the refuse of Phœnicia and Egypt deported before the flood. They lived by acts of great violence and barbarity, and took a long time to form themselves into societies, and to learn the arts of cultivation and house-building; and it was not till fresh bands of colonists came over that the states were formed.

The oldest of the states was Sicyon, said to have been founded in B.C. 2089, by Ægialeus, its first king, who is understood to have been contemporary with Terah, the father of Abraham. Twenty-five other princes are enumerated after him; but there is no memorable action to notice in connection with them. The nineteenth in succession was Sicyon, after whom the settlement was named. From the last, Zeuxippus, the state passed into the hands of the priests of Apollo, and subsequently to the Amphietyons, till it became finally incorporated with Argos.

The kingdom of Argos was founded in B.C. 1856, its first king being Inachus, the son of Oceanus and Zethys. A list of nineteen kings of this state is given, the third name being that of Apis, supposed to be the same who fled to Egypt, and was worshipped there in the form of a bull. The fourth king, Argus, gave his name to the state. The tenth, Danaus, was an usurper, who fled from Egypt after having vainly conspired there against his brother

Sesostris,* and landed in Greece in B.C. 1474. From him was descended by the mother's side Perseus, the son of Jupiter and Danæ, who, having accidentally killed his grandfather Acrisius, withdrew from Argos and founded the kingdom of Mycenæ. Among his successors in Mycenæ were Eurys-theus, Atreus, Agamemnon, Orestes, and Tisamenes, or Penthilus. The history of the first, and of the labours imposed by him on Hercules are well-known. Hercules never came to the throne himself; but it was recovered by his descendants, in B.C. 1140, from Tisamenes, or immediately after his death, as is differently reported, and was retained by them for four reigns, after which the kingly government was overthrown. Argos, after the retirement of Perseus from it, was held by Talaon, and passed through him to Diomedes, its last king, who distinguished himself at the siege of Troy.

Attica, or Athens, is generally believed to have been founded by Cærops, an Egyptian, in B.C. 1556, though the story goes that he married the daughter of Actæus, who was the king of the country before him, and only succeeded to the throne by right of his wife. He brought with him from Egypt a large colony of Saits, a people who lived near one of the mouths of the Nile, who probably helped him to conquer the country. After having secured possession of it, he organized the government on a systematic footing, dividing the state into districts, with a chief town in each, and introducing laws and civil institutions among the people. One of the institutions introduced was that of marriage, which, till then, was not known among the Greeks, who used their women in common. He also inaugurated the worship of Jupiter, taught his subjects the art of navigation, and founded the court of Areopagus, which Solon afterwards improved. The names of sixteen successors are mentioned. The fourth, Erichonius, the son of Vulcan, is said to have been the inventor of coaches.

* Not Egyptus, as is asserted by some authorities. The era of Egyptus was earlier by above six hundred years.

The seventh, Cecrops II., gathered together his people, who were much scattered, and taught them to live in towns. The tenth, Theseus, the son of *Ægeus*, was famous for many heroic achievements; and also, for new-modelling the government by uniting the provincial towns more closely into one confederacy, and establishing one jurisdiction over them all; by forming an assembly of the townsmen of these boroughs, to which he intrusted the election of the king; and by depriving royalty of every privilege except that of presiding in the council, and of commanding in time of war. By these changes he virtually introduced the democratic form of government in Attica. But his exertions on behalf of the people were not appreciated; he was only rewarded by ingratitude, and was eventually expelled from the throne by Menestheus, who found greater favour with the mob. Theseus retired thereupon to Sycros, where he was killed by stratagem; Menestheus lived to the time of the Trojan war, in which he was slain. The last king of Attica was Codrus, who voluntarily sacrificed himself in B.C. 1068, to rescue his country from the inroads of the Dorians, and with whom the royal title was extinguished.

The kings of Attica were succeeded by Archons, or chief magistrates, of whom thirteen were hereditary and for life, and taken from the family of Codrus. This change was introduced, not from any dislike to the royal power, but out of respect to the last monarch, who gave up his life for the benefit of the state. The appointment of perpetual archons lasted from B.C. 1068 to 752, after which the office was made decennial, on which condition seven archons ruled from B.C. 752 to 682. After them the duration of authority was further reduced to one year, and the authority itself divided among nine persons at a time, one of whom acted as the chief. When Draco was chief archon he established a new code of laws, which soon became inoperative from its extreme severity. From the state of anarchy that followed Athens was rescued by Solon, another chief archon, who introduced a second new code, which, in a later age, was

largely borrowed from by the Romans. He also entirely remodelled the constitution of the state, by dividing the people according to property into four classes, instituting a supreme council of five hundred persons for debating on public affairs, and reorganizing the Areopagus as a final court of appeal. By these arrangements the government was virtually converted into a democracy, and the chief-magistrate made entirely dependent on the people.

Boeotia, better known afterwards by the name of Thebes, was founded in B.C. 1455, by Cadmus, whom some authorities represent as an Egyptian, and others as a Phœnician. He is universally allowed to have introduced the use of letters into Greece from Phœnicia, where, if not born, he had at all events resided for several years. He also taught trade and navigation to his people, and introduced among them the use of brass. Among his successors were Laius, Œdipus, Eteocles, and Polynices, whose unfortunate history is well-known. The wars of Eteocles and Polynices brought on the invasion of Thebes by seven confederate chiefs, and its final capture by their sons, best known by the title of the Epigoni; after which the Bœotians were expelled from their country by the Thracians, and settled at Arne in Thessaly. The last king of Bœotia was Xanthus, at whose death, in B.C. 1126, it became a commonwealth.

Arcadia was so called from Arcas, the son of Jupiter and Calista, and is supposed to have been founded by Pelasgus, by some considered to be the same with Phaleg or Peleg, the son of Eber, in whose days the earth is said to have been divided; whilst others consider Pelasgus to have been contemporaneous with Cæcrops. The Arcadian traditions enumerate a list of twenty-five kings, of whom the eleventh, Agapenor, was at the siege of Troy. The last three kings were Aristocrates I., Hicetas, and Aristocrates II. Of Hicetas nothing particular is known. The other two were stoned to death by their own subjects—one for ravishing a virgin in the temple of Diana, the other for betraying his allies, the Messenians; after which the regal dignity was abolished, in B.C. 668.

Thessaly is supposed to have received its name from Thessalus, the father of Græcus, after whom all Greece was named. The country was divided at one time into four, and afterwards into ten, districts; but the history in regard to them is very uncertain. Two of the principal states were Thessaly Proper and Phthia. Deucalion was king of the latter at the time when the deluge that goes by his name occurred, which is generally supposed to have been distinct from what is called the universal deluge, and to have been caused by the irruption of the Euxine Sea, which then for the first time rolled down into the Mediterranean. Of Thessaly Proper, Æson was king in B.C. 1280, and was succeeded by his brother Pelias, who sent out the rightful heir, Jason, to Colchis, in search of the Golden Fleece; possibly to open out with that country a trade in flax, which was its staple produce. This is the story of the Argonautic expedition, in which the flower of all Greece was engaged. The next Thessalian prince of name was Achilles, who took the most prominent part in the Trojan war; which, however, was eventually brought to a successful conclusion by the sagacity and wisdom of a greater general, Ulysses, the king of a petty island in the Ionian Sea. The most important event in the history of Thessaly was its war with Phocis, which was pursued with irreconcilable hatred on both sides. The war arose from the Phocians having ploughed certain lands consecrated to the Delphic god, for which a fine was imposed on them by the court of the Amphictyons, which they refused to pay. The quarrel soon became general, and many states were involved in it on one side or the other; and it lasted till the time of Philip of Macedon, who put an end to it by finally defeating the Phocians.

The little state of Corinth is said to have been founded by Sisyphus, the son of Æolus, in B.C. 1514, but did not continue in his line beyond eight generations, after which the Dorians drove out the original inhabitants, Aletes, one of the Heræclidæ, becoming king in B.C. 1089. Eleven princes reigned in succession to Aletes, the last being

Automenes, in whose reign, B.C. 777, the Bacchidæ, another branch of the Herculean race, took possession of the government, and introduced an oligarchy, electing annually from among themselves a prytane, or supreme magistrate. In B.C. 657, Cypselus, who was related to the Bacchidæ by the mother's side, succeeded in wresting from them the sovereign power. He was succeeded by his son Periander, and he by his nephew Psammetichus, who reigned till B.C. 584, when the Corinthians asserted their freedom by establishing a republic.

The original name of Sparta was Laconia; it was founded by Lelex, in B.C. 1516. Lelex was succeeded by Myles, and he by Eurotas, who changed the name of the state, calling it Sparta, after his daughter Sparte, and Lacedæmon, after his son-in-law, her husband, who succeeded him. The seventh successor to Lacedæmon was Hippocoon, who and his ten sons were killed by Hercules; upon which Tyndarus, his brother, whose daughter Helen gave rise to the Trojan war, was raised to the throne. Tyndarus was succeeded by Castor and Pollux, his two sons, after which, the male line failing, the throne was assumed by Menelaus, the husband of Helen, in right of his wife. From Menelaus the succession descended to his sons by a former marriage, after whom it reverted to the descendant of Helen, in the person of her son-in-law and nephew Orestes, whose son Tisamenes (who succeeded both at Lacedæmon and Argos) was driven out by the Heraclidæ, one of whom, Aristodemus, became king of Sparta. Aristodemus was succeeded by his twin sons, Eurystheus and Procles, from whose time the government took a new form, and, instead of one sovereign, became subject to two (the successors of Eurystheus and Procles respectively), who reigned jointly,—this bipartite succession continuing for several generations. The history of the state for two centuries after this exhibits nothing but repeated wars between the Spartans and the Argives, and domestic discords, caused mainly by the division of authority between two kings, which lasted till the time of Lycurgus, when the government was remodelled.

The main improvements introduced by Lycurgus were the constitution of a senate of thirty persons endowed with supreme power in all civil matters, which only left to the kings their titles and honour, and the management of religious and military affairs; the division of land equally among all the citizens; and the removal from them, as far as possible, of every species of luxury. The whole object of Lycurgus was to make the people good citizens in peace and hardy soldiers in war; the circulation of all money except of iron was prohibited; no trade was suffered to be carried on; and the mechanical arts were allowed to be exercised only by slaves. Sparta was thus at once converted into a military commonwealth, which so far benefited the inhabitants, that, from this time forward, they everywhere assumed the character of conquerors.

Macedon was founded in B.C. 813, by Caranus, an Argive, a descendant of Hercules. From its situation in the extreme north of the country, and its slow progress in civilisation, it remained unnoticed till some five hundred years after, or the time of Philip and Alexander the Great. Of its intermediate history very little is known beyond this, that it was constantly at war with its immediate neighbours, the Pierians and Illyrians; and that it suffered considerably from the first incursions of the Persians in Europe, and in the reign of Darius Hystaspes was tributary to him.

Of the petty states of Elis, Ætolia, Locris, Doris, and Achaia, no separate notice of each is necessary. Elis had the reputation of having been peopled by the descendants of Elisha; for which reason the inhabitants boasted that they were the aborigines of the Peloponnesus, looking upon all others as interlopers. One of its kings was Augeus, the owner of the Augean stable, which was cleansed by Hercules; another was Epeus, who was present at the siege of Troy, and built the famous wooden horse; a third was Iphetus, the restorer of the Olympic games. Of Ætolia one of the kings was Ceneus, whose daughter Dejanira was married to Hercules. A son of Ceneus, named Tydeus, was a great hero; and his son Diomedes has already been

mentioned as having distinguished himself in the Trojan war. Locris likewise sent a hero, named Ajax, to the siege of Troy; but it derives more fame from Amphictyon, one of its chiefs, who established at Thermopylæ the well-known Amphictyonic Council,—a confederacy between twelve nations to assemble once in six months to consult upon each other's affairs and settle all pending disputes in Greece. The Dorians are principally known for their migrations and conquests, by which they created a great revolution of races, which we shall shortly notice. Achaia was parcelled into twelve small republics having democratic constitutions, which were mutually united by a league founded on perfect equality.

The two most ancient races in Greece were known by the names of the Pelasgi and the Hellenes, whom some writers consider to be the aborigines of the country, as distinguished from the colonists that came to it, whether from Babel, Egypt, or Phœnicia. This necessarily assumes a special provision made for peopling Greece, similar to the provisions made for other lands—that is, by a set of first parents particularly assigned to it; which is not at all improbable, though we have no tradition or story about it. The character given of the Pelasgi would seem to support the idea, as it does not correspond with that given of any of the several branches of the family of Noah, or with that known of the Phœnicians and Egyptians. At the time when we first find the Pelasgi, they are seen scattered and dispersing, so that there was probably a prior period, when they were a mighty and collected race; and it is not unreasonable to conclude that a powerful race of this kind, with such a peculiar character, had a distinct origin. As for the Hellenes, who first made their appearance under Deucalion in Phthia, Wilford was disposed to regard them as Scythians, by identifying Deucalion with Cálá-Javan (or Deo-Cálá-Javan), the barbarian king whom Krishna defeated in India, and by supposing that, on being rooted out of his own country, he came over with his Bactrian followers to settle in Greece. If the flood of Deucalion was

distinct from that of Noah, of which the proof is not very clear, this hypothesis is entitled to great consideration, and would establish the first descent of the Scythians into Greece; but if, on the other hand, the floods of Noah and Deucalion be the same, as seems not at all unlikely, the era of Deucalion would go back into greater antiquity than that of Krishna; and we should then infer that the Hellenes (in common with the Pelasgi) only represented the survivors of the aboriginal population of the country, who, on account of the deluge, moved off from one part of it, which must have suffered most, to settle in another.

Be that as it may, we read that the Hellenes, gaining strength, were in time able to drive out the Pelasgi before them, and to spread themselves all over Greece. They were subdivided into four branches—namely, the *Ætolians*, *Ionians*, *Dorians*, and *Achaïans*. The gradual spread of these tribes all over Greece was effected by several raids and migrations; and with them were mixed up the subsequent batches of colonists that came from across the sea, who contributed largely to give a definite character to the nation. The formation and development of the nation was carried on throughout what are called the Heroic ages. The main incidents of those ages were, (1) the expedition of the *Argonauts* to *Colchis*, in about B.C. 1250; (2) the war of the confederate princes against *Thebes*, in B.C. 1225; (3) the capture of *Thebes* by the *Epigoni*, in B.C. 1215; and (4) the *Trojan war*, in B.C. 1194. The last was followed by a very stormy period, in consequence of the many disorders prevailing in the ruling families of the country, especially in that of *Pelops*. Commotions still more violent soon arose, caused by the restlessness of the rude tribes of the north, particularly of the *Dorians* and the *Ætolians*, who, under the guidance of the descendants of *Hercules*, strove to obtain possession of the *Peloponnesus*. These disturbances convulsed the whole of Greece, and finally resulted in the occupation of *Argos*, *Sparta*, *Messene*, and *Corinth* by the *Dorians*, while *Elis* fell to the share of the *Ætolians*. They also forced several of the Greek tribes to emigrate and

take forcible possession of the coast of Asia Minor, where they established many colonies. These colonists went out as soldiers, sword in hand, and conquered new homes for themselves, sometimes taking women by force from their neighbours, oftener by treaties of friendship. The islands of the *Ægean* Sea and of the Mediterranean were similarly seized upon; and the whole face of Greece was thus completely changed. The system of government, too, was gradually altered, from the hereditary clanship which had hitherto generally prevailed, to different forms of republicanism, which now became common, each city or district having laws, customs, and interests of its own, but all combining together into one body for general purposes of aggression or defence. Two of the states only aspired, and were admitted, to be superior to the rest—namely, Athens and Sparta—not only for their greater power, but also for their better constitution and laws; and the history of these states, and of their constant jealousies and wars, assumed for a long period the most important phase of Grecian history.

The contentions between Athens and Sparta were only for a time held in abeyance during the Persian war. The causes of that war were, as we have stated elsewhere, the vanity of the queens of Persia, who sighed for the ministration of Grecian women as slaves; the revolt of the Asiatic Greeks against the Persian power, which was aided and abetted by the Athenians, who also took part in setting fire to Sardes; and the intrigues of Athenian refugees, particularly of Hippias, in the Persian court. A general requisition was first sent round by Darius Hystaspes to the several Grecian states to acknowledge the authority of Persia; and this was complied with by all of them, except Athens and Sparta, which rejected the demand with disdain. We all know what followed. A Persian army of one hundred-thousand, or, according to some authorities, of three hundred-thousand, men invaded Greece, and was met and defeated at Marathon by an Athenian army of ten thousand men. Darius became furious, and vowed vengeance; but death prevented him from giving effect to his

threats, whereupon his legacy of hatred towards Greece was taken up by his son, Xerxes, who personally headed a still mightier invasion of the country. The opposition he met with at Thermopylæ from a band of three hundred Spartans first showed him of what stuff his enemies were made. Next followed the glorious naval victory gained by the Athenians off Salamis, which all but annihilated the Persian fleet; while all that the Persians were able to achieve against the Greeks was confined to the burning of Athens, which its inhabitants had abandoned. After this, Xerxes was only too glad to decamp; and the subsequent simultaneous land engagement at Platæa and naval fight at Mycale were sufficient to expel the Persians finally from the shores of Greece. The tables were now turned; from being the aggressed, the Greeks became the aggressors. To free their Asiatic countrymen from the Persian power now became their pretext for continuing the war on Asiatic ground; and this went on for thirty years, till the Persian fleet being completely defeated by Cimon, near Cyprus, Artaxerxes I. was compelled to sign a treaty of peace with Athens, recognising the independence of the Asiatic Greeks.

This was the most brilliant period of Athenian power and glory. Liberty proceeded from Athens alone, as Herodotus very forcibly puts it: "I will say that liberty proceeded from Athens: many will murmur; but I will say it, for it is true." The dispute for pre-eminence between Athens and Sparta was shortly after revived; and as the naval superiority of the former made her mistress of most of the islands and maritime cities, which yielded but a forced obedience, it enabled Sparta to assume the character of the deliverer of Greece from Athenian thralldom. The war that followed lasted for twenty-seven years, and is known by the name of the Peloponnesian war. It ended with the capture and humiliation of Athens, in B.C. 403; after which Greece soon found the yoke of her deliverers to be infinitely more galling than that of the people who had been named her oppressors. The Athenians ceased henceforth to possess political

eminence in Greece, and devoted themselves very largely to literature and philosophy, almost justifying the exclamation attributed in a later age to a Gothic chief who, during the sack of Athens in the third century after Christ, forbade the destruction of books, saying: "So long as we leave those to them, they will never apply themselves to the use of arms." On the other hand, the Spartans established a military rule all over the country, which was much complained of and severely felt, till their supremacy, again, was subverted by the Thebans, under Pelopidas and Epaminondas, in B.C. 371. The success of the Thebans, however, was exceedingly short-lived, and terminated with the death of their leaders; and the eventual result of these struggles was the weakening of all the parties concerned, which paved the way for the supremacy of Macedon.

While the other states of Greece were thus weakening themselves by civil dissensions, Philip, king of Macedon, the sixteenth in descent from Caranus, its original founder, was gradually extending and consolidating a kingdom hitherto regarded as of little note in Greece, and which had lived at different times under the protection of Athens, Thebes, and Sparta. The first object which he sought for and attained, was to get Macedon acknowledged as a member of the Hellenic league. He next appeared as the deliverer of Thessaly, and ended by making it a province of his own empire. He then took advantage of the sacred war waged against the Phocians to enter Greece, reduced the Phocians, and then defeated the Athenians and Thebans, who, alarmed at his ambition, had united their powers to oppose him. This terminated the independence of Greece. The Spartans had kept aloof when the general interests of the country required an united effort to smother the common enemy; their mistake soon became irreparable, and Philip well understood the value of the advantage gained by him. The battle of Chæronæa was followed by his being selected generalissimo of the Greeks by the Amphictyonic Council, to wage war with Persia, in which direction his aspirations were diverted. While he

was preparing for this, however, his life was cut short by the hand of an assassin—an officer of his guard—who stabbed him to death in the midst of the festivities celebrating the nuptials of his daughter.

The whole time of his successor, Alexander the Great, was spent in wars in Asia. In Greece all he did was to destroy the city of Thebes, which, with the aid of the Athenians, had attempted to throw off the Macedonian yoke; thus finally depriving the Greeks of their hope of re-establishing their independence. He then got himself appointed their generalissimo against Persia, in the place of his father, and, completing the preparations which Philip had commenced, set out on his expedition against that country. Crossing over to Asia Minor, he won the two battles of Granicus and Issus; after which he entered Syria and Palestine, and thence diverged into Egypt and conquered it, advancing as far as Libya, to the temple of Jupiter Ammon. Returning thence to Asia, he passed the Euphrates and the Tigris, and defeated the Persians in the battle of Arbela, which, at one stroke, made him master of the Persian empire—that is, of all the territory from the coast of Asia Minor to the banks of the Indus. He then went to Hyrcania and the Caspian Sea; thence to Parthia, Bactria, and Sogdiana, as far as the Jaxartes, to break a lance with the Scythians. Marching back thence, he proceeded to India, where he crossed the Indus and gave battle to a king named Porus, and defeated him. His wish to enter into the heart of the country was opposed by his own soldiery, upon which he moved down the Indus to view the sea, and then commenced his backward journey towards Greece. But he was never able to reach his country, having drunk himself to death at Babylon, or being poisoned there, as some writers assert, in B.C. 323.

Alexander was succeeded in his conquests by his generals, who first acted as viceroys, but eventually assumed independent authority. In a short time they became involved in quarrels amongst themselves, and this enabled the Grecian states to resume their independence, which was

maintained for some time by the association of several of them into a league formed in B.C. 280, which was known as the Achaian league. Macedon afterwards got entangled in a protracted war with Rome, which was already gradually extending her empire on all sides; and the final result of this was that the Achaian league and the independence of Greece were subverted together by the Romans, in B.C. 147—that is, at the same time that Carthage was overthrown.

We have rapidly run over the history of Greece, though it was scarcely necessary to do so, since the fullest details in regard to it are well known to every reader of the day. But an account of the Ancient World without any notice of Greece and Rome would, it appeared to us, have resembled the acting of the play of “Hamlet” with the part of Hamlet left out; and it is only to provide against such culpable omission that we have introduced matter which many readers will perhaps consider entirely redundant. The peopling of Greece we attribute partly to growth from within, and more largely to immigration from Scythia (if the Hellenes came from Bactria), and from Phœnicia and Egypt, allowing, however, that the descendants of Javan may also have contributed to it to some extent. The earliest races of the country, spoken of as its original inhabitants, were, as the inference assumes, derived from no other land; and, if they intermixed with any other people, it was with the antediluvian immigrants from Phœnicia and Egypt, who came over at a time when civilisation was, even in their own countries, yet unknown,—every assumption of this nature being necessarily based on the belief, as already expressed in the section on Phœnicia, that the art of navigation was known to the ancients even before the flood, of which the preservation of so many families from the deluge furnishes, perhaps, the most conclusive evidence. The colonists who came afterwards, including the Scythians from Bactria, brought with them a better knowledge of things, such as had been subsequently acquired in their respective countries; and this enabled them to lay the

foundation of that civilisation which Greece attained with their aid, and afterwards diffused throughout the world.

The letters and religion of Greece were both derived from foreigners, though on being received they were stamped with the Grecian brand, and, as it were, separated and distinguished from the sources from which they were taken. The lively imagination of the Greeks soon added to the number of divinities imported, by personifying the sciences and the arts, and by typifying wisdom, beauty, and love. The oracles, festivals, and games were especially Grecian institutions, based on the religion that was borrowed, but as original ideas emanating therefrom. The games combined together a variety of objects—religious, festive, and political—but bearing in every aspect a character peculiarly Greek and national. The wandering minstrelsy of Greece was, if we may so call it, another institution peculiar to the country; or, if borrowed, it was derived possibly from countries very far to the east, such as Persia and India, where some traces of it may yet be met with. Still more peculiar to Greece were the gardens or groves of the philosophers, in which an alley of trees or a shrub of flower-plants separated from each other distinct systems of thought and the most radical diversities of opinion. Great things were achieved in these quiet retreats, but not without great exertions of the brain. The free institutions of Greece were peculiarly adapted for the fullest expansion of the mind, and the prodigious efforts made towards that end were crowned with the greatest success. In no country, either of ancient or modern times, was the mind better developed than in Greece. Not only have the poems of Homer never been rivalled; we have no historians to place side by side with Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon; no philosophers (notwithstanding their antiquated notions and erroneous methods of reasoning) to take the precedence of Socrates, Plato, and Pythagoras; scarcely any dramatist besides Shakespere to rival Sophocles, Euripides, and Æschylus. Most of the arts, also, were cultivated by the Greeks with the greatest success.

The finest statues the world could boast of were those executed amongst them; it is said of the Venus of Praxiteles that the gazers believed that the marble moved and was about to speak, which induced many to apply their lips to those of the statue, taking it for a living form. Of painting, the Greek islands produced more and better artists than all the rest of the world taken together; and of architecture, the most approved styles to this day are those which have been borrowed from the Grecian school.

Nor was Greece very backward in general matters of practical usefulness. As a mercantile power she rose in importance from the destruction of Tyre; and understood her business so well that even the horrors of civil war were never allowed to interrupt her commercial activity, every species of merchandise being, by common consent, allowed to be conveyed with safety through states at feud with each other. The ambulatory commerce of Greece was particularly extensive, and almost incredible journeys were performed by merchants in carrying it on. The communications between the interior of Asia and the eastern parts of Europe had been open ever since the remotest periods of antiquity, and caravans from Greece penetrated almost to the borders of China with the produce of the West, coming back laden, in return, with all the riches of the countries they passed through. In connection with these operations we stumble over the first notions of bills of exchange in the ancient world. Isocrates mentions the instance of a trader who had come to Athens with some grain, having delivered a draft of this nature for money due to him in some place on the Euxine Sea, which was taken up without difficulty, the parties on both sides appreciating fully the advantage which exempted their money from exposure on a sea covered with corsairs and pirates.

What, however, pre-eminently distinguished the Greeks from all the nations that preceded them, were their political institutions, which were peculiarly their own. The first monarchical form of government may have been borrowed by them from, or adopted in imitation of, the institutions

in force in other countries; but the changes subsequently introduced owed their origin to the spirit of the nation, and kept pace with it as it was gradually developed. The people, as distinguished from their rulers, appeared in everything from the earliest ages; the right of making peace or war belonged exclusively to them at all times, almost in all places: and in this mob-importance consisted the whole secret of their aggrandizement. The migrations and wars of the ruder tribes, under the guidance of the Heraclidæ, threatened at one time to deface this distinctive feature; but, fortunately, even those ruder tribes participated in the same general love for independence, and the final result of the disturbances was the stable foundation of republicanism everywhere, in the place of hereditary government. The chivalrous spirit of the nation had been aroused at an earlier age—namely, in that of the Argonautic expedition and the Trojan war. To it was now added the love of political freedom, and these two elements together formed the backbone of the national character. The feelings thus developed, originally encouraged by Homer, were cherished ever after by the ties of a common religion; by the habit of consulting the same oracle at Delphi; by the influence, such as it was, of the Amphictyonic Council; and by the public games. The hostile attempts of Persia to subjugate Greece early gave these feelings their full swing, just when such a swing to exercise them was absolutely needed. The greatness of Athens and Sparta was the natural consequence of the development this gave to their energy and strength. Unfortunately, a surfeit of success was followed by the dominance of party spirit of a local character in the place of real patriotism; and, when the national cause was sacrificed to isolated aggrandizement, the decline of the country became as precipitate as its elevation had been marvellous.

CHAPTER IX.

ROME.

ROME is generally understood to have been named after Romulus, its founder; and Italy after Italus, a king of the Siculi. The main divisions of the country were—(1) Upper Italy, comprising the countries of Cisalpine Gaul, and Liguria; (2) Central Italy, consisting of Etruria, Latium, Campania, Umbria, Picenum, and Samnium; and (3) Lower Italy, or Magna Græcia, consisting of Lucania, Bruttium, Apulia, and Calabria. The mountain-ranges in the country are two—namely, the Alps, which occupy Upper Italy, and separate it from the other contiguous kingdoms on the north; and the Apennines, which run down the central and lower divisions of the peninsula, and divide it into two almost equal parts. The whole length of the peninsula is well watered by a number of small rivers, of which the Po, the Adige, and the Tiber are the most important. The soil of the plains has always been famous for its fertility, and the productions are so various that they have obtained for the country the appellation of the garden of Europe; but the mountain-tracts, on the other hand, are almost altogether barren, or, at all events, admit of little cultivation only. The position of the country seemed to indicate it as the natural centre of trade; but that advantage was never sought for by the inhabitants, nor attained.

The first inhabitants of Italy were named Aborigines, being believed by some writers to have lived in the country from the beginning, and not to have derived their origin from any other nation; while other writers change the appellation into Aberrigines, which means that they were a wandering people, supposed to have rambled over from

other countries to Italy, where they lived by rapine. Among this tribe were reckoned the Umbri, the Siculi, and the Ausones, three of the most powerful races in the country; and from these were derived the Auranci, the Rutuli, and the Osci. The other ancient races were the Pelasgi, the Arcades, and the Tyrrhenians, all of Greek extraction, from whom were derived the Sabini, the Ænolri, the Tarentini, the Calabri, and many others whom it is scarcely necessary to name. Of the origin of one ancient race, the Volsci, a very warlike people, no account is given; and of another, the Ligures, it is said that it cannot be definitely stated whether they were descended from the Greeks or the Gauls. The sacred writers conveniently get over all difficulties by asserting that Italy was first peopled by the descendants of Kittim, the fourth son of Javan, who, having spread themselves over Macedon, wandered thence to the coast of the Adriatic, and were tempted by the fruitfulness of Italy to cross over and settle in it. According to some of these authors, the first to cross over were the Ætolians, after whom Italy was named; the Pelasgi, the Arcades, and other Greek races following after them, as they began to receive marvellous accounts of the richness of the country which invited them.

Of the history of Italy before the foundation of Rome, very little worth mention has been recorded. The Umbrians and Ligurians are both said to have had a great name at one time, but no details in regard to them are known till their wars with the Romans made them more famous. The same remark applies to the Etruscans (Etrurians), in regard to whom it is only known that they were for many ages masters of Umbria. Of the Latins, or the people of Latium, more circumstantial information is available, though a great part of it seems to be more or less fabulous. The names of three kings who reigned over them before the time of Æneas are given as Picus, Faunus, and Latinus, in the reign of the last of whom the Trojans are said to have arrived in Latium. At first Latinus

contemplated opposing the new-comers, taking them for pirates ; but, on hearing the history of their misfortunes, he was touched with compassion, and not only offered them his friendship and a tract of land to live in, but ratified the alliance by giving his daughter, Lavinia, in marriage to their chief. This led to a war with Turnus, king of the Rutuli, to whom Lavinia had before been promised, the result of which was that the Rutuli were defeated, while Latinus was slain ; whereby Æneas obtained possession of the Latium throne in right of his wife, in whose honour he built the city of Lavinium.

Æneas was succeeded by his son, Ascanius, who built another city named Alba Longa, which afterwards became the seat of the empire. Twelve kings are named as having reigned in quiet succession to Ascanius, the last of them being Procas, who left two sons, named Numitor and Amulius. Of these, the first succeeded his father to the throne, but was not able to retain it, being driven from it by his younger brother, who, to secure the succession in his own line, killed the only son of Numitor, and consecrated his sole daughter, Rhea Sylvia, to the worship of Vesta, which subjected her to perpetual virginity. The precaution of Amulius was, however, ineffectual. The vestal was waylaid and ravished by one of her lovers, and gave birth to two sons, when, to give her disgrace a less offensive character, she boldly affirmed that the god Mars was the father of her offspring. All that Amulius could do now was to consign the children to destruction, and they were accordingly thrown into the Tiber. But, the river having overflowed its banks, the waters in retiring left the cradle in which they were exposed on dry ground, where they were found by the chief of the king's shepherds, and suckled and brought up by his wife, Acca Laurentia, called, for her licentious life, Lupa, which signified both a harlot and a she-wolf.

These children were named Romulus and Remus, and are generally supposed to have founded Rome on the spot where they were saved, after having restored their grand-

father to the throne of Latium. All historians, however, are not agreed on this point, as some pretend that Rome was founded by a party of Trojans, and named after Roma, a lady of distinction, who was with them ; others, that the name was derived from Romanus, the son of Ulysses and Circe ; and others, again, that Romus, a king of the Latins, was the real founder of the city. Following the general opinion, however, we take it for granted that the colony was established by Romulus, in B.C. 753, and that his brother Remus was killed by him at the same time, out of jealousy, both having aspired to the honour of governing the new state. The state consisted at the time only of a number of huts, peopled by vagabonds and slaves, amounting to about three thousand souls ; besides whom, the founder brought with him a band of about three hundred followers. These inhabitants were divided by him into three tribes ; each tribe being subdivided into ten *curiæ*, or companies of one hundred men ; and each *curia* into ten *decuriæ*, or families, with commanders over each, named tribunes, *curiones* or centurions, and *decuriones*. The people were also divided, according to birth and dignity, into patricians and plebeians ; the personal followers of Romulus being classed among the former, and the other inhabitants among the latter. A senate was at the same time appointed to assist the king with its counsels, and consisted of two hundred persons chosen out of the patricians, and distinguished by the appellation of *patres*, or fathers, both for their age and their fatherly care of the state. The powers and privileges of the king, senate, and people, were also precisely defined ; laws were laid down for the regulation of religion and festivals ; and the relations in private life were authoritatively established to give support to parental authority, secure protection to the people by the appointment of patrons and clients, and introduce subordination and discipline into every grade of life.

The colony being thus founded, Romulus next devised means for augmenting the number of its inhabitants, and

to this end opened an asylum, or place of refuge for fugitive slaves, insolvent debtors, outlaws, and homicides; and, as the neighbouring states refused to give their women in marriage to such scum, he took the bold step of seizing and carrying off by force the women of the Sabines, after having invited them to a feast; which led to a war with that people that lasted for many years, after which the Romans and the Sabines became one nation. By these means, in one single reign, Rome became one of the most powerful states in Italy, possessing numerous subjects, a national religion, and a regular army. But the king who achieved all this was unable to secure the favour of all parties; and, being murdered by the senators and secretly disposed of, the people, who loved him, were persuaded to believe that he was taken up into heaven.

The next king, Numa Pompilius, was a Sabine philosopher, who reprobated the encroachments of ambition, inculcated reverence for the maxims of justice and morality, erected a temple to good faith, and established the religion of the state on a stable foundation. The third king, Tullus Hostilius, who was of a warlike character, vanquished several enemies of the state, demolished Alba Longa after the famous combat of the Horatii and Curiatii, compelling the Albans to unite with Rome, and established, by strict regulations, military discipline and the principles of war. The next sovereign, Ancus Martius, extended the territories of Rome still further to the sea, incorporating the conquered nations with the loyal subjects of the state. His successor, Tarquinius Priscus, brought the Etruscans under subjection, enlarged, embellished, and fortified Rome, and augmented the number of senators to three hundred, at which figure it remained fixed for several ages. He was succeeded by his son-in-law, Servius Tullius, the most remarkable of the kings of Rome—one by nature more inclined to peace than war, but who was nevertheless obliged to fight with several of his neighbours, whom he defeated, especially the Etruscans, who had attempted to shake off the Roman yoke. He also completed the enclosure of the

city, placed Rome at the head of the Latin confederacy, added a fourth tribe to the three established by Romulus, instituted the census, and redivided the people into six distinct classes, according to the value of their property, each class being subdivided into a number of centuries, or companies of one hundred men, which virtually completed the framework of a commonwealth. Servius was killed by his son-in-law, Tarquinius Superbus, who succeeded him; but one of Tarquin's sons, Sextus, having violated a noble Roman lady, named Lucretia, the indignation both of the patricians and plebeians was roused against the royal power; and this led to the king being deposed and banished, and the establishment of a commonwealth, in B.C. 506.

The only immediate change in the internal constitution of Rome, caused by the abolition of royalty, was the transfer of the kingly power to two consuls or magistrates, who were selected annually from among the patricians, conjointly by the senate and the people. This arrangement, within a few years, gave rise to violent dissensions between the patricians and the plebeians, the former of whom were anxious to keep intact the original arrangement of Romulus, by which all power in the state was retained in their own hands; while the latter threatened a total secession if every right and privilege were not shared in common. The result of these disturbances was, that the people were allowed to elect tribunes of their own, the number of those officers being fixed at first at five, and afterwards increased to ten. The powers vested in these officers included the annulment and suspension of the orders of the consuls and the senate whenever they appeared to be inimical to the interests of the commonwealth; and this led them in a short time to misuse their authority, and to act as aggressors in defying the consuls, and in crying down the patricians, which gave rise to contests that were exceedingly violent and much prolonged—such as led to the defection of Coriolanus, and made the war with the Volsci so furious.

In the midst of these dissensions, and with the object of providing against them for the future, ten persons, called Decemvirs, were appointed, in B.C. 453, to prepare a code of written laws for the state; and they compiled the laws known as those of the Twelve Tables, which adopted in part the regulations of the Greek republics, especially those of Athens. These laws, though they were generally approved, still gave rise to new discords with reference to the barrier they set up against marriages between the patricians and plebeians. The fact is, the plebeians not having been represented among the Decemvirs, who were selected from the patricians alone, objected not only to the laws prepared by them, where they pressed hard against their own class, but also to the continuance of the Decemvirs in power as magistrates, which position they had quietly assumed after having codified the laws, and in which they had been guilty of several acts of great oppression. Among these acts were the assassination of Dentatus, a plebeian renowned for his military exploits, and the forcible abduction of Virginia, the daughter of a centurion, who killed her with his own hands rather than suffer her to be prostituted by Appius, the Decemvir who was persecuting her; and the final result of the struggle was that, besides the modification of the enactments especially objected to, the Decemvirate was abolished.

For many years subsequent to this, the history of Rome offers nothing remarkable apart from the continuation of the discords between the patricians and the plebeians, and an uninterrupted series of wars with several of the petty states immediately around her, which trained the nation to war, and eventually made them masters of the whole of Italy. Of these contentions the most important was the siege of Veii, which, like Troy, held out for ten years, after which it was reduced by Camillus. That general also repelled an incursion of the Gauls under Brennus, after they had taken possession of Rome and burnt it to the ground, for which success he was named "father of the country, and second founder of Rome." These services

enabled him to patch up a peace between the patricians and plebeians, by which one of the consulships (both of which had hitherto been held by the patricians) was given up to the plebeians; while two new offices—a prætorship and a curule ædilship—were created for the patricians, whereby the object of political equality between the two classes was attained.

In the era that followed, Rome was involved in a war with the Samnites—a ferocious and warlike people who inhabited that part of Italy which is now called Abruzzé. In all her previous contests Rome was opposed only to her immediate neighbours—all petty states, which were subdued with comparative ease. The Samnite war was a more arduous affair, which gave rise to many complications, and lasted for seventy years. A war was also carried on with the Tarentines, the allies of the Samnites, these being aided by Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, the greatest captain of the age; notwithstanding which, both the Samnites and Tarentines were forced to submit to the Roman yoke. After this, Rome found herself engaged in a war with Carthage, which had given offence by assisting the Tarentines; and this struggle was renewed three times, and after various vicissitudes, terminated by the destruction of Carthage, in B.C. 147. In the intervals of the Carthaginian war, Rome, which had already conquered the whole of Italy, added to her dominions parts of Gaul, Spain, Illyria, Macedon, and Greece; the independence of Greece being terminated at the same time when Carthage was destroyed. In another century the bulk of Gaul on one side, Numidia and Egypt on another, and all Asia Minor to the confines of Persia on a third, were annexed, while Britain was invaded; and Rome thus virtually became the mistress of the world.

The termination of these foreign wars was followed by another era of civil contentions—more violent than any that had preceded it—between the aristocratic and democratic parties, the latter being headed by their tribunes. The disturbances began under the tribunate of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, when the agrarian law was passed,

sanctioning a new division of the lands of the republic, which affected with special severity the properties usurped by the great aristocratic families. In one of the tumults Sempronius Gracchus lost his life; but his policy was taken up by his brother Caius, during whose tribunate the ferment became still greater, till he also was assassinated. The Gracchi were followed by a demagogue of a different class—namely, Marius, the conqueror of Jugurtha, who was raised to the consulate, the aristocratic party finding a representative in Sylla, who had triumphed over Mithridates. The fierce disputes between them were closed by the final elevation of Sylla to the dictatorship, which was now for the first time made perpetual; but this unconstitutional authority he himself abdicated voluntarily, a short time after. Intermediately, an irruption of the Cimbri and the Tentons was repelled by Marius; a social war was terminated in which several of the Italian states which had been conquered by the Romans fought for equal privileges with the citizens of Rome; Mithridates, king of Pontus, the great enemy of Rome in the East, was vanquished, once by Sylla, as noticed above, and again by Pompey; and a war with slaves and gladiators, who fought to revenge their wrongs, was successfully concluded by Crassus. But even all these disturbances did not terminate in rest. A free state like Rome, with no middle class in it, was naturally exposed to perpetual contests for power and influence on the part of its chief leaders, and the contentions begun by Marius and Sylla were followed up by those between Julius Cæsar and Pompey. In B.C. 60, a triumvirate was formed between Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, for guiding the affairs of the republic in common. But this, which was a union merely of interest, soon broke down from jealousy; and the death of Crassus, who lost his life a little while after in a war with the Parthians, brought the two principal competitors forward, and gave rise to that violent contest which was finally decided at Pharsalia. Pompey being there totally defeated, the victorious Cæsar was at once acknowledged master of Rome; and he was also

elected consul and perpetual dictator, with the title of Imperator, or Emperor. These new honours gave rise to much dissatisfaction and misunderstanding. In times of imminent danger dictators had always been appointed before, and the functions of other magistrates suspended, but only for limited periods, to meet the pressing emergencies of the hour. The elevation of Cæsar to the office permanently, after Sylla himself had surrendered it, seemed to indicate that he aspired to royal powers; and this led to the formation of a conspiracy against him, and to his being murdered. The evil, however, was not removed. The contests for supreme authority still went on, the competitors only being different, till the final defeat of Mark Antony at Actium left Octavius Cæsar absolute master of Rome: upon which he was appointed consul for life, with the titles of Augustus and Imperator, in B.C. 29.

Rome now became a monarchy once more, the sovereign of which continued to be called Cæsar, or Emperor. The reign of Augustus was mild and efficient, and for Rome itself exceedingly peaceable. The empire was extended by the complete subjugation of northern Spain and western Gaul, and also by the acquisition of the countries south of the Danube; but there were no wars or commotions of any kind inside of Italy. The whole period was, besides, a remarkably brilliant one as regards the cultivation of literature and the arts of peace; and it has since become a proverbial expression to call the most flourishing literary era of a nation its "Augustan" age. The great authors of the period were Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Cicero; Sallust and Livy also belonged to the same age; and it was at this time that Jesus Christ was born in Judea. The private life of Augustus was not blameless, and his domestic troubles were very great; but he reigned so well as a king that divine honours were paid to him after death. His successors, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, were infamous, alike as men and as sovereigns. By the death of Nero—who, on being condemned by the senate, laid violent hands on himself—the house of Cæsar became extinct,

upon which the armies of the empire raised each an emperor of its own. The first selection was that of Galba, made by the legions of Spain and accepted by the senate; but the prætorian guards of the city refused to admit it, and, killing Galba, raised Otho to the throne. The army in Germany, on the other hand, proclaimed their leader Vitellius, by whom Otho was slain, and who, in his turn, was killed by Vespasian, the general of the Syrian legions, by whom he was chosen. Both Vespasian and his son Titus reigned well; but Domitian, the successor of Titus, was characterized as the worst tyrant that ever occupied the Roman throne. After him, the empire had some respite in a string of five emperors who were pre-eminently venerated for their talents and virtues. The reign of Nerva was very brief, but prosperous; that of Trajan, while distinguished by prosperity at home, was also signalized by military conquests abroad—Dacia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and a part of Arabia being added to the empire. The chief aim of Adrian was the preservation of peace; and he gave up some of the conquests of his predecessor to secure it, directing all his energies to the reform of the internal administration, to effect which he personally inspected the whole empire. In the reign of Antoninus Pius war was unknown, the happiness of the people being the sole object of government held in view by him; and this was also the rule of conduct with his successor, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the philosopher, who only fought with the Parthians and the Germans to preserve the frontiers of the empire inviolate.

The decline of the Roman empire followed the age of the Antonines. Commodus, the successor of the second Antoninus, was a monster of cruelty and lewdness. He was murdered by his own servants and mistress; upon which Helvius Pertinax, the præfect of the city, was made emperor, but remained so only for three months, after which he was killed by the prætorian guards, who put up the empire to sale. The purchaser was Didius Julianus, a wealthy senator, who eventually paid for the honour with

his life. In the meantime, the armies of Illyria, Syria, and Britain, proclaimed their respective generals, Septimius Severus, Pescennius Niger, and Albinus, as emperor; and the first, who was the ablest of them, finally succeeded to the post, and proved to be deserving of it. The successors of Severus, from A.D. 211 to 284, may be passed over without notice, as quite unequal to the times, which were full of troubles, owing to the irruptions of the barbarians; the sole exception being Aurelian, who ascended the throne in A.D. 270, and reigned for about five years, which he filled with great achievements, including the conquest of Zenobia, the queen of Palmyra and the East.

In the reign of Diocletian (A.D. 284 to 304) a division of authority was introduced in the administration of the empire, by which the responsibilities of the sovereign were considerably lightened. The constant pressure of the barbarians on every side had so augmented those responsibilities, that Diocletian preferred to share his throne with Maximin; besides which, the two emperors took two subordinate princes, as Cæsars, to assist them, the whole empire being thereby divided between four rulers. The successors of Diocletian and Maximin were Constantius and Galerius, who adopted a similar arrangement; but after them, Constantine, surnamed the Great, having vanquished five rivals, again became sole emperor. It was during his reign that the seat of empire was removed to Constantinople; and, as he himself became a convert to Christianity, the Christian faith became the religion of the empire also, from A.D. 312. The last prince of the house of Constantine was Julian, surnamed the Apostate, so called for his efforts to restore idolatry. He began his rule with great vigour by checking the inroads of the barbarians, and, what was equally difficult, by reforming the luxury of the court; but his life was cut short in a war with Persia, and his good intentions had no time to fructify. His successor, Jovian, reigned only for eight months. Valentinian I. succeeded Jovian, and associated with him Valens, his brother, who had charge of the Eastern States. It was in this reign

that the Huns entered Europe, and, pressing upon the Goths, forced a large portion of them to settle within the boundaries of the empire. The next emperor of note, Theodosius the Great, was the last who ruled both over the Eastern and Western States; and he was entirely successful in resisting the encroachments of the Goths, and preserving the integrity of his dominions. After him, his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, divided the empire between them, the first taking the Eastern, and the second the Western States; and from this time these divisions were for ever parted. The Western Empire was now beset on all sides by the barbarians—by the Visigoths, under Alaric, who broke into Italy, and took Rome, in A.D. 409; and by the Caledonians in Britain, the Franks in Gaul, the Burgundians on the Upper Rhine, the Heruli and Longobards in Austria, the Ostrogoths in Thrace, and the Vandals in Africa. After the death of Alaric the Visigoths left Rome, and settled in Spain; but Italy continued to be harassed by land, by the Huns under Attila, and from the sea, by the Vandals under Genseric, who was master of the Mediterranean. While the empire was thus close pressed in every direction from without, one continued succession of intestine revolutions raged within it, throughout the entire period embracing the reigns of some ten sovereigns, who succeeded one another rapidly. The last of these rulers was Augustus Romulus, in whose reign Odoacer, chief of the Heruli, finally destroyed the Roman empire in A.D. 476, being, in his turn, driven out by the Ostrogoths, who were eventually expelled by the Longobards, or Lombards, who held possession of Italy until the time of Charlemagne. The Eastern Empire, which from this time came to be known as the Greek Empire, still held on for a thousand years longer, being generally characterized by a rule of great feebleness, though still claiming nominal sovereignty over Rome, with occasional displays of vigour under Justinian, Heraclius, and the two Comneni—Alexis and John. The reign of Justinian is particularly celebrated for the vigour and

bravery of his two generals, Belisarius and Narses ; and, still more so, for the compilation of the code of laws known by the name of Institutes, Pandects, and Novels, which formed the basis of the civil law of Europe. In the reign of Constantine Palæologus, Constantinople was captured by the Turks, in A.D. 1453, and the Greek Empire overthrown, Greece Proper only being emancipated from the Turks some four hundred years after.

From the account we have given above, Italy seems to have been originally planted from within ; her aborigines being apparently derived from the first parents, whoever they were, to whom was assigned the task of peopling this part of the world. She has no traditions of the age in which the deluge occurred, beyond this, that the Umbri, as Dionysus Halicarnassus says, lived where it took place, and escaped from it—thus deriving their name from Ombros, a shower. It is impossible, for this reason, to say precisely to what extent the country was affected by the flood ; but the very escape of the Umbri shows that there must have been many survivors from it, as in most other countries ; and there is nothing to prove that any colonising nation came to Italy from Babel to repopulate the country. The hypothesis about the descendants of Kittim having first spread over Macedon, and then proceeded to Italy, is one of those haphazard statements of which so many have been flung out by the ecclesiastical writers at random—most probably as feelers, certainly without any sort of proof to support them. It has been admitted by those writers that Italy was well-peopled within about five hundred years after the flood ; and yet, they do not seem to have observed that this could not well have happened by the process which the Kittim-planting theory involved. Indigenous planting, scarcely impeded by a partial destruction (if any) by the flood, could alone have secured such early peopling ; and, if there was colonisation to aid this aboriginal development, it must have commenced from a period anterior to the flood, and must therefore have proceeded from Phœnicia and Egypt—that is, from the same sources from which the first

colonising parties of Greece were derived. Greece and Troy, at a later date, undeniably made up the full complement of population that was required; but the traditions of an earlier age, vague as they are, clearly indicate that the original source from which it was drawn was different.

The most remarkable feature in the history of Rome is, that the main parts of the internal constitution of the state were formed during the first era of her foundation—we had almost said, during the first reign. The constitution chalked out by Romulus, and completed by Servius Tullius, virtually finished the framework of the republic that followed, and testifies strongly to a considerable degree of political civilisation even at that early date. The character of the people was formed afterwards. The original inhabitants of Rome were, we read, vagrants and slaves; but the struggle for liberty which they had to maintain from the outset with the surrounding races, was able to produce even among these that republican spirit which forms the main feature of their history. The republic lasted for four hundred and sixty-one years, throughout the whole of which period there was a constant internal struggle for a complete equalisation of rights among all classes of the inhabitants; and, if the people did not always succeed in getting what they wanted, they were at all times able to keep the aristocracy within due bounds.

All this while Rome was also constantly engaged in wars, the republican period being that, in fact, within which the most important conquests were achieved,—that in which the Romans fought all their battles with their own hands, both in their own country and abroad, the states of Italy paying tribute in military service only. At this time they were, in the strictest sense of the expression, a nation of warriors, and never submitted to know what failure was. Carthage was scarcely inferior to Rome in any respect but this, that while Rome fought with her own soldiers, Carthage depended mainly on her mercenaries: the result was, that Rome triumphed, and Carthage was destroyed. To

secure this advantage, the Romans followed a policy which was peculiarly their own ; they gradually formed a nation of Romans, even in the most distant of their provinces, by the introduction of colonies, and the admission of deserving provincials to the freedom of Rome. The vanquished were thus blended with those by whom they were conquered, and formed one nation with them. Before this consolidated force everything gave way ; and in overthrowing both Greece and Carthage, Rome knew her own strength and used it. She also knew that no similar strength existed anywhere in any of the foreign states of the day, and was thus able simultaneously to maintain sanguinary wars both in the East and the West.

The increase of her foreign connections at last began to tell on the morals of the people, whose first decline may be dated from the conquest of Greece, which spread the contagion of effeminacy previously caught by the Greeks. But the progress of the plague was yet slow, the constant conflicts at home preventing a rapid increase of degeneracy during the days of the republic. In after years, the fall of Mithridates, and the conclusion of the war in the East, brought immense riches into the empire ; but even that of itself did not create quite as much mischief as the discovery that the means of maintaining immense armies had thus been acquired. The wealth for it having been obtained, the introduction of large standing armies followed the close of the republic ; and this eventually caused the entire separation of the military order from the rest of the people, and the extinction of that national spirit among the citizens which had contributed so much to their greatness. The wars of the empire being now fought by soldiers as distinguished from the citizens, the trade of the soldier became a distinct profession, from which the more polished citizens voluntarily withdrew, leaving it to peasants and barbarians ; while those peasants and barbarians, in their turn, sneered at the peaceful citizens, and arrogated to themselves distinct privileges, not excluding that of raising emperors of their own choice, to all which the people were

obliged to submit, having rendered themselves unfit to resist. The good emperors, who confined their efforts to preserving the conquests made by the republic, were able to restrain the armies to a great extent by their own virtues which commanded involuntary respect: but the bad rulers were so many that the armies soon became outrageous in their conduct, and further enervated the empire by the remissness of their discipline. The final result of all this was that, in a short time, the empire was unable to produce good soldiers of her own to recruit her battalions, and was obliged to call in the aid of hirelings from the various barbarian bands that now occupied the different countries of Europe. It is not strange that after this Rome fell; it is only strange that, under such disadvantages, she was still able for more than two centuries to resist the formidable pressure all around her from without. The first enemies under whom her might succumbed were those of her own bosom—the tyrants and soldiers who ruled over her. It was after these had exhausted her strength that the might of the barbarians prevailed.

The different stages of government—kingly, consular, and imperial—that prevailed in the country by turns, and the relative strength of the parties—patricians and plebeians, aristocrats and democrats—at different stages, have been noticed. Under the good emperors, Augustus downwards, the government was an absolute monarchy disguised by the form of a commonwealth, in which the senate still acted an important part, both as a council of state and as a court of justice. From the time of Constantine the Great this disguise was thrown off, and the empire openly assumed a despotic character, being ruled over by governors and other officers who derived their power directly from the throne. The people had attained by this time the last stage of effeminacy, and the emperors and nobles the last stage of vice and luxury; and so, hand in hand, in the midst of such enjoyments as the circus, the theatre, and the fights of gladiators and wild beasts afforded, the moral character and political status of the nation went down together.

The religion of the Romans was borrowed from that of the Greeks; they worshipped the same divinities, with only a slight variation of names. Their literature also was derived from the same source; in fact, they had no literature to speak of till after the conquest of Greece, though their success subsequently was so signal. The authors of the Augustan age have been already named. Among the other great writers that Rome produced, the names of Tacitus, Seneca, Plutarch, Catullus, Lucretius, Lucian, Juvenal, Martial, the two Plinys, and the two emperors, Julius Cæsar and Antoninus, will be remembered; but no attempt is here made to enumerate them all. Nor was literature the only thing in which Rome distinguished herself, and nearly rivalled Greece. Her paintings and sculptures, and the greatness and beauty of her architecture, also won for her a world-wide renown. These, and especially the last, were generally undertaken by the state; but often, private individuals also vied with their rulers in contributing to the grandeur and beauty of their eternal city. The triumphal arches, porticos, baths, theatres, aqueducts, and highways of Rome are well-known; but the refinement of the inhabitants was so great that private houses always retained their simplicity. There never was a people who in private life lived so moderately; among whom frugality and parsimony were held in greater honour—that is, before the days of their corruption. Perhaps it is this which made them really so great. Their simplicity and moderation made them all the more steady, patient, and laborious; and these, with their love of liberty and their patriotism, led to that elevation which has yet had no equal.

CHAPTER X.

RÉSUMÉ.

WE have noticed, in the preceding chapters, the origin, growth, and decline of many nations, and the vicissitudes that several forms of government have run through in different lands. It only remains now to sum up the results of our inquiry, with special reference to the more important events we have reviewed, and the relation they severally bore to each other. The chief epochs in ancient history that require particular attention are those of (1) the creation; (2) the deluge; (3) the migration of nations: (4) the founding of the great empires of China, India, Persia, Assyria, Phœnicia, Egypt, &c.; and (5) the founding of the later and still greater empires of Greece and Rome. Along with these should be considered the different religious eras of Mythology, Buddhism, Christianity, and Mahomedanism; and also the eras rendered important by the subversion of the several ancient empires, as they dropped off, one after another, from the roll of nations.

Of the first epoch—namely, that of the creation—the best account we possess is that given in the Bible, which is at once impressive, perspicuous, and nearly complete; so much so as scarcely to require any other evidence to corroborate or explain the statements of its sublime Genesis. All the further testimony available to us on the subject consists mainly of fragments and poetical traditions, to which we have referred as supplying much information in regard to those countries which did not fall especially within the scope of the Bible to notice; but we do not say that we believe wholly in the fictions which have thus been preserved, even though we have not considered it advisable to reject them altogether. Several of the statements fill

up a disagreeable void in the history of nations which, unknown to the Jews, attained the very highest acme of glory and power; and, where these are not outrageously absurd or morally impossible, we have accepted them as not untrustworthy, and therefore useful in explaining the nature of the problem before us, even if they do not quite enable us to solve it satisfactorily. Of such character are the statements that, while Adam and Eve passed their days in the paradise of Chaldea, the same Providence that had placed them there, had also placed, for a precisely similar purpose, Pwankoo and his contemporaries in China, the Brahmâdicas and Brahmarishis in India, the Mahábuds in Persia, Protogonus and Æon in Phœnicia, and Hephæstus and his subjects in Egypt. We do not assert that this was so; it is enough for our purpose that it was not impossible that it should be so: and as it appeared to us that an arrangement of this nature was necessary to the simultaneous peopling of the whole earth, and as the evidence of such simultaneous peopling is conclusively overwhelming, we have not refused to receive the only narrations of events bearing on the subject that have come down to us. Since the system of the Genesis will not tide us over the difficulty before us, it would have been simply absurd to reject those other systems and traditions which enable us to do so.

In respect to the second epoch—that of the deluge—we have fully expressed our views already, especially in the first chapter, explaining why we understand that the inundation was not universal, although there is no doubt that it was very general. In Tartary, Persia, and Phœnicia it did not occur at all; the higher regions of China, India, and Egypt were not altogether submerged; Greece has no knowledge except of that deluge which was caused by the Euxine bursting its way through the Bosphorus and precipitating itself into the Mediterranean, which may or may not have been the same deluge as the first one; and Rome does not know of any. Of course the destruction of life was very great wherever the inundation

was severe : but we have seen that the human race was not depopulated by it ; that the higher seats of the race in Central Asia were not at all approached by the waters ; and that even the lower plains elsewhere, which were overflowed by them, did not lose all their population. The history of China speaks of damages done, but does not speak of any depopulation therefrom ; India names a number of families that were saved ; precisely similar evidence comes to us from Egypt ; and the Bible history itself, which speaks of general depopulation, expressly refers only to the descendants of Adam and Eve, who had perhaps never extended beyond the limits of Chaldea.

Our first and primary conclusions, then, are, that there was an ancient state of things which necessarily rejects the ideas of Adam and Eve only having been created for peopling the earth, and of the whole population of the earth having been destroyed by the deluge with the sole exception of the family of Noah, which was saved to repeople it ; that this first era terminated at about the age of Yáou, Kaiomurs, Tánauk, Satyavratá, and Orus ; and that, vague and confused as the traditions respecting it may be, there is enough light to explain the general features of the problem, that provision was made by Providence simultaneously to people all or most of the great regions of the earth, and that they were originally so peopled without reference to each other.

The first migration of nations, we read, occurred from Babel a hundred years after the flood. This was perhaps absolutely necessary to people the surrounding countries which had suffered most from that visitation ; but it is absurd to suppose that the family of Noah, with such increase as it had attained in the course of a century, was able to undertake the repeopling of the whole earth. According to our reading no such assistance from it was required, as all the old countries—China, India, Persia, Tartary, and Egypt—were already as well-peopled as Assyria herself ; though it is of course possible, and not improbable, that, lured by the fertility of the other

countries, some of the colonising parties from Babel did proceed to them—not to repeople them, but to share in their possession with those by whom they were already peopled. A more general migration of nations commenced about three or four hundred years after from Tartary, where, undisturbed by the deluge, the human race had been expanding largely from the beginning of the world; and it was this migration—not that from Babel—which inaugurated the greatest changes all over the globe. Everything begins anew after the different nations of the earth are thus strengthened; forests are cut down, new hamlets erected, arts invented, societies formed, and laws enacted.

The primitive condition of the human race, both before the flood and for some years after it, exhibits two very opposite phases. Of most countries the traditions commence with a golden age of great innocence and happiness. The scriptures of the Jews and the Christians; the sacred books of the Chinese, Hindus, Persians, Assyrians, and Egyptians; all the records, in fact, which have been preserved among the most ancient nations,—are replete with pictures of the happiness and virtue of the first inhabitants. But, on the other hand, the records of old Greece and Rome describe a state of original barbarism and disorder which it took many generations to root out. According to one account, the first ages everywhere were those of gods and heroes, while every succeeding age was one of comparative decline and debasement. The other, on the contrary, anticipating the Darwinian theory, depicts the first specimens of the human race as being scarcely distinguishable from the brute creation by which they were surrounded, and states that they did not attain decent shape and behaviour until after many generations. Perhaps neither of these representations should be rejected as untrue. The first of men were undeniably innocent and virtuous; but frailty and corruption made rapid advances among them, as traditions all over the world indicate, and led to those restraints and ordinances which society im-

posed on them. Where these restraints and ordinances were early introduced, the higher nature of man, with which existence started, was not altogether darkened or deformed, and what was noticed was merely a gradual decline, as from gold to brass. But where the delay in regulating society was great, the reign of barbarism was necessarily prolonged, and appeared as the chief feature of the primitive period, the first start with innocence being too short-lived to be remembered.

The restraints and ordinances of society were first instituted in the ancient countries of Asia, which for several ages formed the principal seats of progression. We have already narrated the steps by which the great empires in that continent were founded, and were enabled to attain their high pitch of elevation. In China up to the time of Yu, and even after it; in India up to the days of Ikshwaku and Buddha; in Persia to the reign of Jemsheed; in Assyria throughout the time of Nimrod and Ninus; in Tartary from the days of Táunak to those of Alanzá Khán; in Phœnicia up to the time of Eluin and Uranus; and in Egypt to the close of the era of the demi-gods,—all the endeavours of the patriarchs of mankind were almost entirely confined to the formation of family ties, domestic senates, and societies, which in time were amplified into governments. Simultaneously were carried on discoveries in arts and inventions useful to life, which, before the use of letters, seem everywhere invariably to have been credited to the most distinguished men of the community—generally to the kings. It is for this reason mainly, that the old kings and patriarchs appear in such favourable contrast to their successors; and possibly, as being more solicitous to form and preserve their dominions, they were really greater benefactors to mankind. The Assyrian, Tartarian, and Persian empires were the first to show a spirit of restlessness. A thirst of aggrandizement broke out amongst them while the other empires were yet busy in developing their inventive powers; and the bounds of an empire being once trampled down by ambition, turbulence and discord ap-

peared all over the world, subverting that quiet and paternal reign which had distinguished the first ages.

Before the spirit of aggression thus developed became rampant, the settled habits of the antediluvians and of the patriarchs who came in immediately after the deluge were, apparently under the direct guidance of Providence, able to achieve a great deal of rational improvement, which all the disturbances that followed could not dissipate; and among these prominently were the discovery of letters and navigation, both of which were known before the flood, apparently to several nations and without imitation from each other. The history of Phœnicia shows that, in the fifth generation after the creation, the art of venturing out into the sea was discovered in that country by Hypsuranius and his brother Usoüs; and the early peopling of Greece and Rome, and, still more conclusively, the deliverance of many families in different countries from destruction by the flood, emphatically prove (notwithstanding all the arguments which have been urged by the primitive fathers against the assumption) that some sort of navigating vessels was certainly known by almost all the ancient nations from the remotest times. Similarly, the history of China shows that the art of writing was discovered in that country in the reign of Hwangté, before the flood; and Berosus mentions that letters were also in use among the western nations of Asia from about the same date, though, the peculiarities of writing in those days having been very dissimilar, it seems exceedingly unlikely that the art was acquired generally by imitation. The Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Italians (Tuscans) wrote from right to left, which appears to have been the general practice. The Greeks, who borrowed the art from the Phœnicians, introduced the peculiarity of writing in alternate directions, the first line being from left to right, and the next reversed, which, from its resemblance to ploughing, was termed "boustrophedon." On the other hand, the Chinese, who probably were the first to discover letters, always wrote in perpendicular columns, beginning from the right hand; which was also at one time practised by the

Persians, as is proved by the perpendicular inscriptions found at Persepolis. Besides writing, hieroglyphics seem to have been known and much used by several nations from very ancient times, having apparently preceded alphabetical writing in all places. The Chinese and the Egyptians were particularly proficient in the art; and so also, in a less degree, were the Hindus, the Assyrians, the Phœnicians, and even the Scythians, the last of whom, when Darius asked them for tokens of submission, are said to have sent to him in reply a mouse, a bird, a frog, and arrows, intimating that he must fight, swim, hide, or fly before them to escape destruction.* The art of printing was also known to the Chinese, though from a later date—namely, the time of Lewpang, or B.C. 206; but it was not known to any other nation of the ancient world even then.

The age of conquests was almost simultaneously inaugurated by the Assyrians, Arabs, Scythians, and Persians. The first conqueror on record was Nimrod, who made war to establish an empire for himself, while his successors did so to extend that empire. The Hyksos penetrated into Egypt a short while after, in B.C. 2084; and the Scythians and Tartars commenced their irruptions at about the same time, getting first embroiled apparently with the Persians. The Assyrian expeditions were conducted by vast armies, which conquered from sheer strength of numbers, and, when outnumbered, were always repulsed. Bactria was taken by two millions of men; India was attacked by three and a half millions, but, as the Indians outnumbered even this force, the expedition was unsuccessful. Sesostris of Egypt, who followed the career of Semiramis, after a long interval, also led large armies to the field; and the Persians adopted the same policy in still later times in their wars with Greece, though in their first martial struggles, in the days of Zál, Roostum, and Cyrus, the number of their fighting men was never very considerable. As for the Tartars, they

* "Unless you can fly like birds, or like mice burrow under the earth, or like frogs plunge into the waters, you will never return, but will perish by these arrows."

were never a powerful, homogeneous race. They fought merely as robber-bands, swelling out into enormous masses for purposes of plunder or conquest, and contracting again immediately after the occasion had gone by. Their conquests were all of a transient nature—*e.g.*, the conquest of Persia by Áfrásáb, of Media by Madyes, and the several conquests made by them in China; but they were found most useful in strengthening countries that were sparsely populated, while the instances are rare of their having colonised on virgin ground, since, even in Europe, the countries they overran seem to have been previously peopled with indigenous savages, like the Pelasgi in Greece, and the Aborigines in Italy.

The epoch within which the great empires of the East were consolidated embraces different dates, widely differing from each other, commencing with the times of Yu in China, Bhárat in India, Cyrus in Persia, Semiramis in Assyria, Oghuz in Tartary, Abihal in Phœnicia, and Sesostris in Egypt. In the empire of China, which was one of the first to develop, the national character was completely formed during the reign of the Han dynasty, the seeds of destruction being planted in it at an even earlier date, in the reign of Shinnung, or previous to the deluge, when civil war first broke out in the country. This, throughout the entire history of China, was the great, almost the only, cause of her weakness, which was further augmented by the introduction, during the reign of the Chow dynasty, of all the evils of the feudal system. The civil wars that followed opened the door for the admission of the Tartar tribes, whom rulers like Ché-Hwangté, Wooté, and Kwang-wooté were barely able to keep out. But the constitution of the country had been so well regulated that her foreign conquerors, in both instances utter barbarians, were easily induced to embrace, by choice, the manners of those they conquered, to settle in the country, and to become naturalized, by which means the name and nationality of China were preserved; so that virtually it was not China that became subject to Tartary,

but Tartary that became dependent on China. This, more or less, was also the case with India, Persia, and Egypt; but, unfortunately, the principal feature of the civilisation of those countries—and especially of India, China, and Egypt—was a state of quiescence that, after reaching a certain pitch of elevation, bound down progress to remain at that point for ever.

India, divided into petty states from the earliest period, never formed a powerful empire; but the national character was a well-formed one, and became so by the time of the great war of the *Mahábhárat*. Almost all the primitive races in the country were martial; and their early intermixture with the Tartars, who entered it as conquerors, but only to be conquered by its institutions, made them still more so, strengthening a character which was maintained up to the time of Alexander the Great, and even after it. One curious fact connected with the original spirit and pursuits of the Hindus is, that, from the earliest ages, they seem to have known the use of some sort of firearms, which are constantly referred to in the ancient books of the country, and to which we have alluded as having been used by Ságara, in repelling the Tartars, so early as two thousand years before Christ. The great weakness of India was that inherent to her constitution. The petty wars between the several states, and their subsequent further partition into smaller principalities, was enough fully to debilitate a power that never had any real intrinsic strength; and this paved the way for that succession of Mahomedan invasions which worked the downfall of the country.

The greatness of Persia was based on the institutions of Cyrus and Darius, and was retained so long as those institutions were not neglected. The character of the ancient Persians was strictly moral, and their life exceedingly moderate. Even Plato admired the manner in which the royal children in that country were brought up, and proposed it as a model for adoption in Greece. But this elevation was not long retained. It was early, as early as the time of Xerxes, followed by great

voluptuousness and crime, accompanied by the abandonment of all those exercises which had made the nation strong; and this brought on a sort of national supineness, under which the empire rapidly broke down. Its decline commenced with its first contact with Greece, the death-blow to it being afterwards given by Alexander the Great. But the institutions of the country were remarkably good; and this accounts for the resurrection of its power (a feature extremely rare in the history of nations) under Ardisheer Babigan, the Sassanian. The highest degree of civilisation (estimated by the old standard) was attained by the country in the time of Noshirwán the Just, which was again succeeded by an age of marked lasciviousness, in which the energies of the empire were finally extinguished, crime preceding the destruction of power and greatness on both occasions.

The greatness and decline of Assyria are best accounted for in the Bible. This, of all the countries of the world, is said to have been the first peopled; it was here that the first notions about fixed abodes and political associations were supposed to have been conceived and carried out; and it certainly did become a great empire and the seat of learning and civilisation before most other countries. But the history of its greatness and civilisation was a history of misdeeds and irreverence. Of the successors of Semiramis it has only been recorded that "they lived and died;" and the Assyrian inscriptions certify nothing more in addition beyond this, that they hunted and waged petty wars during the remissions of their debauchery. The long era that followed the reign of Semiramis is only once distinctly relieved, towards its termination, by the ability and vigour of Nebuchadnezzar, whose successors, again, were as vicious and profligate as any princes that had preceded them. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that "the praise of the whole earth," and "the beauty of the Chaldee's excellence," was so quickly overthrown.

The Tartars founded empires in other countries, generally by mixing with the original inhabitants. In their own

lands their habits were, for the most part, pastoral; and there was no attempt towards the establishment of monarchy except among one or two tribes, markedly in that which owned Oghuz Khán in one age, and Chingez Khán in another, the duration of the monarchy in both instances being singularly brief. The colonisation effected by the Tartars was based on the intent of finding out better means of living commodiously than their own country could afford, and was backed by conquests and plunder; and this was the character of all the colonising expeditions of ancient times, with the exception only of those which were undertaken by the Phœnicians and the Romans, the first of whom anticipated the policy of a more modern era and founded settlements for the furtherance of commercial enterprises, while the second carried out a policy peculiarly their own, of manufacturing Roman citizens in the most distant provinces of the empire.

Of the Tartars and the Phœnicians, however, we do not actually know much, though the latter were by far the most important people of all others, in one respect, in primitive times. The most daring achievements of the Tartars by land were more than equalled by the achievements of the Phœnicians by sea; and yet, besides the traditionary tales of Sanchoniatho about her remotest times, and passing allusions to her by Greek authors and in the pages of the Bible, the history of Phœnicia is a blank, though a knowledge of her early civilisation and maritime achievements may be gleaned at random from the histories of the neighbouring nations. The kingdom started into vigour apparently at the time of Uranus, the son of Eluin; civil war was introduced in it by Cronus, but after that era, wars generally did not much distract the nation during the earlier ages; their days of greatest glory were those of Hiram and Baleazer. The country was first absorbed by the greatness of Assyria, then by that of Persia, and finally by that of Greece.

The strength of Egypt was gradually consolidated by Busiris, Osertesens I., the Thothmeses I. and III., and

Sesostris; and culminated in the reign of Shishak. Her decline commenced early, and was greatest when the Ethiopian Sabaco usurped the throne. By the time of Psammetichus the national power had to be propped up with foreign troops; and, if it was still sustained, it was only by the force of the good laws and regulations of the country. Like Persia, Egypt also exhibited a revival of energy after absolute decline—namely, under the reign of the first three Ptolemys; but the cases were not analogous, since the rule of the Ptolemys in Egypt was only that of foreigners. The decline of Egypt was entirely of internal growth. Civil war was commenced in the country from the days of Osiris and Typhon, but was not often repeated in later times. The priests and the bull Apis must therefore share between them the odium of its fall. Of its greatness we have spoken already, and the ruins of the pyramids survive yet to attest it. Besides their loftiness, there were scientific mysteries connected with them, all of which have not yet been unravelled, and perhaps never will be. Of the largest pyramid each side of the base multiplied five hundred times gives the exact extent of a geographical degree. But it has pleased Providence to deride both the science and the vanity of man; or, may be, it is only on account of their connection with science that these vast monuments have been suffered to stand so long, instead of being summarily overturned, as the Tower of Babel was.

Of the later empires of Greece and Rome, the general character was in several respects dissimilar from that of the older countries of Asia and Africa. The first difference is noted in the representations of the expeditions of Sesostris, as shown by the publications of Champollion, by which the original inhabitants of Greece and Rome are described as barbarous savages clad in skins of animals, a condition in which the Asiatic aborigines never appear. But, if this tells against the later empires, everything else speaks greatly in their favour. For the most part, the history of all the other nations is only a record of military occurrences and the personal achievements of their kings. It is not till

we come to the days of Greece and Rome that questions of civil polity, and the sayings and doings of the people, arrest our attention. The history of Greece, in particular, exhibits the popular character in its best light. The intellectual development of the nation was of the highest standard. In morals their superiority was not equally prominent, but still it was with them that monogamy first came to be recognised in the world. But what was most peculiar of them was the political singularity that they never owned subjection, like the nations that had preceded them, to any single chief; and were never, like them, incapable of national union. In this last respect the Romans were more in advance even than the Greeks—their very commencement as a nation having been under comparatively free institutions. Of both nations patriotism (which was more or less an appreciated virtue in all the countries of the ancient world) was the predominant passion—this love of country being further ennobled by a love of civil liberty which was peculiarly their own. In both countries the people for many ages represented and exercised the royal power; and Virgil truly uses the expression *populem regem* in speaking of them. Even during the short periods when kings were tolerated amongst them, the government depended in reality on the laws—very unlike the state of things in the other countries we have noticed, in most of which the laws depended on the whim and caprice of the sovereign. Even the form of a kingly government did not abide in either country long. In Greece, a popular form of government was virtually introduced in Attica as early as the days of Theseus; and in Rome, the framework of the republic was all but completed by Servius Tullius. The actual revolution from royalty to republicanism did not happen in either till the kings, dissatisfied with their legitimate honours, attempted to override the people; but the real power in both rested with the people from the very earliest times.

The great fault of the Greek democracies was that they had no regular organization, and the people no fixed

principles of action. Even in the best days there was amongst the people a constant clamour for authority, every one being anxious to rule, and no one willing to obey. A government so constituted could not be lasting. It was kept up for a long period by the fear of the several states for each other, and by a love for common enterprises which bound them together. But victory and confidence disentangled these fastenings; the states became selfish; civil dissensions followed; and the bold and the flagitious carried everything before them; which necessarily gave rise to weakness, and was followed by a general disruption. What undid Greece was the glory of her own great actions, and the sense of security it gave rise to. The confederation that was strong enough to resist all the power of Persia and cripple it, was not able to withstand the effects of mutual jealousy and of an excess of liberty.

Of Rome, the best days were those in which the republic was perpetually engaged in dangerous contests both at home and abroad, the people being always most formidable in the midst of their greatest calamities. The hardness of the national character was more than Spartan, and while this lasted—that is, throughout the republican period—Rome was mistress of the world. The old Romans were warlike husbandmen; Regulus and Cincinnatus were taken from the plough; the greatest generals and the best citizens led the humblest lives; in no country were crimes less frequent or punishments more severe. As a rule they were also very moral in their character, certainly more so than the Greeks; and they were more attached to their gods—that is, up to the time of Sylla, when the decline of the nation set in. The corruption of manners that followed was the true cause of the fall of the empire, and was brought on partly by the Epicurean infidelity imported from Greece, and partly by the wars in Asia which spread westward the plague of luxury. Rome under the Cæsars only retained for a time the greatness that was acquired during the days of the republic; it was under the emperors that luxury was largely diffused; with the discipline and

valour of the legions broke down the whole superstructure that had been raised by them, though possibly the destruction of the greatest nation of the ancient world would not have been thus hurried but for the simultaneous irruptions of the barbarians.

It is rather remarkable that almost all the ancient nations, however dissimilar in other respects, started into existence with a correct idea of God and the world, which existed even before the arts relating to the conveniences of life were acquired. Almost all the religions that were current in the primitive ages began with a pure notion of the Deity. Was man, being nearer to his origin, better cognizant of that truth which, as the world grew older, he began to lose sight of? Even the first advances of idolatry and paganism did not altogether ignore the great truth of the existence of one God, superior to all other beings that were worshipped; and it was on this account only that the character of men in all countries during the first ages was marked by so much of virtuous purity. In even later days the republican simplicity and rigid morality of Greece and Rome were derived from a religion undoubtedly false, but not yet wholly impure; and there is no doubt that even such a religion was better than the no-belief of the philosophers which succeeded it, and which undermined the national character by alienating the people from their gods. In most countries, however, idolatry soon became too vigorous, luxurious, and obscene to answer any useful purpose. Its first advances, we read, were opposed by all nations. Wars for the belief in one God were not fought by the Jews alone; even in barbarous Tartary Oghuz Khán fought with his own father on that plea, and defeated and killed him, besides forsaking two of his wives; and the triumph of Buddhism over Bráhmaism in India, and over other descriptions of idolatry elsewhere, was but the triumph of the belief in one God over prevalent idolatry. But idolatry still lived, and every additional year gave it an addition of impurity, till the rational mind began of itself to get startled and alarmed; and it was in this

state of indecision that two successive religions—those of Christ and Mahomet—were introduced into the world—each, like Buddhism, being a protest in favour of the belief in one God, but with dogmas and principles peculiar to itself.

Besides the first notions of God and morality, most of the arts of life appear to have been learnt by the patriarchs of the human race in each country under the direct guidance of Providence—such, for instance, as agriculture, pastoral avocations, weaving, and house-building. All these seem to have been learnt very early everywhere, and could not have been so learnt without assistance when the reasoning power of man was yet in its infancy, and the guidance of analogy and combination was wanting. It will be seen from the accounts we have given that all countries claim for particular individuals born in each the glory of having invented these, which only indicates through what channels they were communicated by Providence in different places. In the history of one country, Assyria, we find it stated that all revelations on these points were made to mankind through a being partly man and partly fish—that is, by a supernatural agent. The history of Tartary, on the other hand, says that a good many of the inventions—namely, a plough, a yoke, an axe, and a golden bowl—were dropped from heaven. It is clear from both accounts that man owed his first knowledge of the comforts and conveniences of existence to the direct intervention of Providence, in whatever shape that intervention may have been exercised; and it is not strange, therefore, that the first families of the human race were steadfastly attached to God, and were, as Manetho explains, so good and zealous in furthering the intentions of Providence, that they were regarded by subsequent generations as gods and demigods.

The longevity of the primitive races is also an item of general belief; and so, likewise, is the notion of their greater size and strength. The statements on these points are so constant in history, that it is scarcely necessary to cite instances. The Bible assertions are well known. More

moderate is the Chinese account, which makes Shun, who lived at the time of the deluge, die one hundred and forty years after it. The Egyptian account gives to Sesostris a height of five cubits, and a breadth of three cubits; the Tartar account makes Oghuz a giant; the heroes of Homer, also, always display superhuman strength, and the poet takes frequent occasion to contrast their vigour with that of the men of his own degenerate times; and contrasts of the kind are still more frequent and "pro-di-gious" in the poems of Válmik and Vyasa. The decrease of life and size dates probably from the deluge; but was evidently gradual.

Of the civilisation of the different nations we have spoken very fully already; and the best proof of it was, perhaps, in the commerce that was carried on among them, both by land and water, and in their frequent communications with each other for social and political purposes. China, India, Persia, and Egypt were known to each other most intimately from the earliest times, as the roving expedition of Osiris, for instance, indicates; and Phœnicia explored regions which even China, India, Persia, and Egypt never dreamt of. This reciprocal intercourse has been fully established from the resemblances we have pointed out in the manners, customs, and religious beliefs and peculiarities of several countries. Even the common names in many places were identical—which could never have been the case but for the free communication that existed between them. We have already remarked that this has very unnecessarily led some authors to assume a race-affinity between the different nations where none really existed; the conclusions arrived at being sometimes grossly ridiculous—*e.g.*, an attempt to establish affinity between the Hindus, Phœnicians, and Greeks, because the names and characters of Cardameswara and Cadmus are not dissimilar; and another, to found on the same basis an affinity between the family of Noah and the Hindus, because both Cardameswara and Cain killed their respective brothers, Daksha and Abel! The affinity of these stories, nevertheless, certainly proves constant intercourse, even if such proof were required.

Travelling was unobstructed in those ages. It was, indeed, not safe to journey in small parties as now, except through particular countries; but the travelling in caravans, we know, was everywhere incessant, and there were several royal highways in existence throughout the whole extent of the south of Asia. It was only owing to subsequent anarchy in Persia, and from the lawlessness introduced by the modern Mahomedans and the Afghâns, that this free intercourse received a check; and the ocean-paths being subsequently opened out by the nations of the West, the old land-routes came to be all but finally abandoned.

The great blots on the character of the ancient nations were pre-eminently their immorality and their cruelty,—that is, subsequent to the era of the Golden Age. In wading through their histories, we frequently stumble over the greatest enormities recorded quite as usual events. Wanté in China, and Chosroes II. in Persia, were murdered by their own sons. Nanda in India, and Candaules in Lydia, were killed by their wives in concert with their lovers. Brother-murder was a thing so common that we cannot stop to notice particular instances: Schironeh, the parricide in Persia, killed eighteen half-brothers in eight months; while Chandragupta of India killed nine. The character of Semiramis, and of the Assyrians generally, was infamous. The morals of the Persians, from the days of Xerxes downwards, allowed sisters, daughters, daughters-in-law, and step-mothers being taken as mistresses and wives. Sister-marriage was also practised by the Phœnicians, Tartars, and Egyptians—nay, even by the Greeks, for we read in Cornelius Nepos, that Cimon married his sister Elpinice, and it is nowhere said that he was reproached for having done so. And the Jewish records tell us that Abraham himself, the choice favourite of Heaven, saw no harm in lending his wife to another, nor David hesitate to appropriate another's as his own. But the grossest instances of lewdness and debauchery were those practised with the sanction of religion, after it was corrupted by idolatry. The pagan temples were, as they are to this day, the scenes

of the greatest depravity. Strabo says, that all Persian virgins were prostituted in the temples of Persia, and all Armenian virgins in the temple of Anaites. Similarly, the Babylonian females were obliged to surrender their persons in Myletta's temple to any stranger who asked them; and the Lydians allowed their daughters to earn their own dowry by the sacrifice of their virtue. Lucian records that at Byblus, in Phœnicia, women were prostituted in the temple of Venus; Justin mentions that the women of Cyprus were similarly treated in the temple of Belus; and Valerius Maximus speaks in the same strain of the practice established in Carthage. In Jove's temple at Egyptian Thebes, a new female was nightly embraced by the presiding priest on behalf of his god; and demoralization of this sort has always been extremely common in India and China. The worship of the sexual emblems was general; and they were always paraded about in procession in all countries in which they were worshipped. Nay, even triumphal monuments—such, for instance, as those raised by Sesostris—were made to exhibit them prominently; images of the male emblem being made to denote the nations that defended themselves valiantly, while those of the female emblem represented the nations that submitted without a contest.

As regards cruelty, the one great crime common to all ancient nations was human sacrifice, which was mostly practised in India, Egypt, and Tartary, but was not unknown even in Greece and Rome. The Egyptian mother was happy if the divine crocodile condescended to accept the offering of her child: the Hindu mother consigned with equal resignation her new-born offspring to the sharks and alligators of the Ganges. Both in Egypt and India, as well as in Tartary, victims in large numbers were also sacrificed at the temples or in sacred groves; and, in Persia, we read that Amestris, one of the wives of Xerxes, entombed twelve persons underground for the good of her soul—which shows that the practice there must have been pretty frequent. Even in Greece, passing over the days of Iphigenia,

we read of the sacrifice of men to Jupiter and Saturn, in the much later times of Socrates and Plato; and there is ample evidence to conclude that all the principal captives who graced the triumphs of the Romans were eventually put to death at the altar of the Capitoline Jove. Besides this, slavery was a recognised institution everywhere, and never so flourishing as in the palmiest days of Greece and Rome; and the castration of human beings, destined to guard over the frail Messalinas who peopled the seraglios and zenánas of the East, was practised not only in Persia, but also in China.

INDEX.

- A** CHAIA, history of, 136.
- Afrásib, invasion and conquest of Persia by, 57; expulsion of, from Persia, 57; further invasions of Persia by, 57; planting of Persia facilitated by the conquest of, 68.
- Aja and Prithu, contemporaries of Satyavratá in India, 36.
- Aláncu, story of the miraculous conception of, 86; descent of Chingex Khán from, 86.
- Alexander the Great, invasion of India by, 43; invasion and conquest of Persia by, 62; general history of, 141; death of, at Babylon, 141.
- Alexandria, establishment and development of, 121.
- Amitraghāta, application of, for a supply of sweet wine and figs, 53.
- Amphictyonic council, the, 136.
- Ancient civilisation, Captain Troyer's opinion of, 4; accounts of, 29, 51, 68, 76, 96, 123, 143, 163, 180.
- Ancient history, questions regarding, requiring to be elucidated, 1; evidence regarding, how to be accepted, 4; available accounts of, 5; chief epochs of, 164.
- Ancient nations, immorality of, 181; cruelty of, 182.
- Ancient records, nature and character of, 2.
- Andhra rájásha, reign of the, in Magadha, 46.
- Arabia*, 103.
- Arabia, general description of, 103; divisions of, 103; subdivisions of, 104; planting of, 104; history of, first section, 105; history of, second section, 107; acknowledgment of Mahomet's mission in, 107; temporal sovereignty in, acquired by Mahomet, and handed down by him to the Káliphat, 107; overrun by the Persians and Romans, but never held by any of its conquerors, 108; mode of government among the people of, 109; peculiarities of the people of, 109; religion of the people of, 109.
- Arabs, two stocks of the, 105; religious innovation among the, 107; extension of conquest and conversion by the, 108; early intermixture of the, with the Hebrews, 108; why regarded as a powerful people, 108; unfavourable opinion entertained of the, by the Persians, 108; divisions of the, into two classes, 109; mode of government among the, 109; accomplishments and peculiarities of the, 109; civilisation among the, 110.
- Aradus, history of, 95.
- Arcadia, history of, 132.
- Árdishaer Babigan, foundation of the Sassanian dynasty in Persia by, 63; vigorous reign of, 64.
- Areopagus, court of, established by Cecropa, 130; improved by Solon, 132.
- Argos, history of, 129.
- Arsmaces, founder of the Parthian dynasty in Persia, 63.

Arts of life, knowledge of the, 179.

Asia, knowledge of the interior of, in ancient times, 12, 180.

Asia Minor, colonisation of, by the Greeks, 138.

Assyria, Media, Lydia, and Tartary, 71.

Assyria, 71.

Assyria, general description of, 71; fabulous history of, 71; account of the deluge in, 72; history of, after the deluge, 72; conquest of, by Sesostris, 74; independence regained by, 74; kings of, 74; division of, into three kingdoms, 75; antiquity of, 75; government of, 76; religion of, 76; civilisation of, 76; résumé of the history of, 173.

Atahuti, Athothis, or Trismegistus, accomplishments and inventions of, 115.

Athens, history of, 130, 138; wars of, with Sparta, 138, 139; capture and humiliation of, 139.

Atossa, daughter of Cyrus, 60; longing of, for the service of Grecian slaves, 60.

Aeneas, settlement of, in Latium, 148.

Ætolia, history of, 135.

BABEL, tower of, 72, 113.

Babylon, kings of, 75.

Bahrám Gor, his visit to India in disguise, 47, 64; marriage of, with a princess of Kanouj, 47, 64.

Báhu, Rájáh, defeat of, by the Scythians, 41.

Bádeo, establishment of a new kingdom at Kanouj by, 47.

Boeotia, or Thebes, history of, 132, 140.

Brahmádicás and Rishis of India, the, 35.

Buddha, religion of, imported to China, 20, 33.

Buddhism and its wars with Bráhmanism, 50.

CHANDRAGUPTA, elevation of, to the throne of Magadha, 44; Greeks in the pay of, 44; alliance concluded by Seleucus Nicator with, 45.

Ché-Hwangté, of China, reign of, 18; war of, against literature and learned men, 19.

CHINA, 14.

China, general description of, 14; division of the historical periods of, 14; mythological history of, 15; ancient history of, 16; discovery of printing in, 19; formation of national character in, 20; history of the middle ages of, 21; connection of, with barbarians, 23; alleged planting of, by the Tartars and Kshetriyas, 26; planted indigenously in regular course, 28; antiquity of, vindicated, 28; civilisation of, 29; government of, 32; religion of, 32; résumé of the history of, 171.

Chinese classics, divisions of, 30.

Chingez Khán, history of, 24, 86; occupation of the northern districts of China by, 24, 86; raids and invasions of, 86; division of the empire of, 86; raids and conquests by the descendants of, 87.

Chow dynasty, reign of the, in China, 17.

Chowain of China, barbarities of, 17; Saracens-like death of, 17.

Colaxais, gifts from heaven to Tartary in the reign of, 83.

Confucius, birth of, 18.

Conquests, inauguration of the age of, 170.

Corinth, history of, 133.

Creation, accounts of the, 6, 7, 15, 35, 54, 71, 91, 112, 164.

Croesus, story of, 80.

Cyrus, of Persia, reign of, 58; last moments of, 58; probably the khákán of a nomad horde, 68.

DARIUS HYSTASPES, of Persia, reign and conquests of, 59; his idea of subjugating Greece, 60; defeat of the army of, at Marathon, 60, 138; introduction of a regular system of government in Persia by, 60; change of religion effected by, 60.

Decemviri, compilation of the laws of the twelve tables in Rome by the, 152; abolition of the office of the, 152.

Deluge, the, not universal, 7, 165; in China, 16; in India, 36; not known in Persia, 55, 67, or Tartary, 67, 88; in Assyria, 72; not known in Phœnicia, 95; futile attempts to make the Phœnician and Hebrew records agree in regard to, 95; in Egypt, 112; in Greece, 137; traditions of, in Italy, 159.

Deucalion, identification of, with Cálá-Javan, 136; flood of, 136.

Doria, history of, 136.

Durrah Kawáni, or the apron of Kawáh, the standard of Persia, 57; captured by the Arabs, 66.

EASTERN or Greek Empire, destruction of the, by the Turks, 159.
EGYPT, 111.

Egypt, general description of, 111; division of the history of, 112; account of the gods, or first dynasty of kings in, 112; accounts of the demi-gods, or second dynasty of kings in, 113; history of the mortal kings of, 114, 117, 118; conquest of, by the Hyksos, or the shepherd kings, 116; expulsion of the Hyksos from, 116; the Israelites in, 116; departure of the Israelites from, 117; conquest of, by Sabaco, the Ethiopian, 118; retreat of Sabaco from, 119; conquest of, by Nebuchadnezzar, 120; conversion into a province of the Persian empire, 120; revolts of, 120; submission of, to Alexander, 121; reign of the Ptolemies in, 121; dependence of, to the Romans, 123; antiquity of, 123; colonisation of, 123; early civilisation of, 123; government of, 124; religion of, 125; division of the people of, into castes, 125; résumé of the history of, 174.

Egyptians, Herodotus's testimony in regard to the hardihood of the, 126; resemblance of the, to the Hindus, 126; Sir W. Jones's theory of the derivation of the, 127.

Eliu, history of, 135.

Empires in the East, consolidation of, 171; greatness and decline of, accounted for, 171 to 175.

FOHI, founder of the second dynasty of sovereigns in China, 15; erroneously identified with Druhya, 27; miraculous birth of, 28.

GENERAL description of, China, 14; India, 34; Persia, 54; Assyria, 71; Media, 76; Lydia, 79; Tartary, 81; Phœnicia, 91; Syria, 97; Palestine, 99; Arabia, 103; Egypt, 111; Greece, 128; Italy, 146.

Ghâsman, kingdom of, founded in Syria Damascena, 106.

God, favour shown by, towards the Jews, 103; idea of, among the ancient nations, 178.

Greece, 128.

Greece, general description of, 128; planting of, 129, 136, 142; principal states of, 129; ancient inhabitants of, 129, 136; division of the Hellenes into four branches, and their expansion over, 137; main incidents of the heroic ages in, 137; convulsions created in, by the Dorians and Ætolians, 137; wars of, with Persia, 138; civil war in, between Athens and Sparta, 139; independence of, terminated by the supremacy of Macedon, 140; conquest of, by the Romans, 142; religion and institutions of, 143; development of the mind in, 143; commercial activity in, 144; political institutions of, 144; monarchical government in, 144; republicanism in, 145; résumé of the history of, 175.

Greeks, colonisation of Asia Minor and the islands by the, 138; letters and religion among the, 143; political institutions of the, 144.

HAN dynasty, reign of the, in China, 20.

Hellenes, 136, 137; divisions of the, 137; spread of the, 137.

Hercules, invasion of India by, 41; labours of, 130; descendants of, 130, 133, 134, 135, 137.

Heroic ages, main incidents of the, 137.

Hieroglyphics, knowledge of, among ancient nations, 15, 29, 126, 170.

Hira, kingdom of, founded in Chaldea, 106.

Houahung, of Persia, reign of, 56; invention of useful arts by, 56.

Huns, defeat of the, by the Chinese, 18, 19; great wall of China built to keep out the, 18, 23; maiden tribute paid by the Chinese to the, 19, 23; progress of the, westwards, 20, 24; in Tartary, 82; entrance of the, into Europe, 158; Italy harassed by the, under Attila, 158.

Hwangté, of China, reign of, 15; achievements of, 30.

INDIA, 34.

India, general description of, 34; absence of annals or historical accounts regarding, 34; antediluvian history of, 35; accounts of the flood in, 36; the Solar and Lunar races in, and the princes of note belonging to them named, 36; division of, according to the Bhárat Khund, 39; invasion of, by Semiramis, 41, 73; invasion of, by Sesostris, 41, 117; invasion of, by Shiahak, 41, 118; invasion of, by Hercules, 41; Scythic or Tartar invasions of, 41; invasion of, by Oghuz Khán, 42, 84; invasion of, by Cyrus, 43; invasion of, by Darius Hystaspes, 43, 59; tribute paid by, to Darius Hystaspes, 43; subsequent connection of Persia with, 43; invasion of, by Alexander the Great, 43, 141; expedition undertaken against, by Seleucus Nicator, and peaceful termination thereof, 45; invasion of, by Noshirwán the Just, 47, 65; invasion of, by Noahized, 48; Arabian invasions of, 48; expeditions against, from Ghazni and Ghor, 48; conquest of, by the Mahomedans, 48; planting of, 49; Scythic or Iranian descent of the people of, 49; religion of, and its divisions and amplification, 50; idol worship in, 51; early civilisation of, 51; ancient trade of, 52; résumé of the history of, 172.

Irgáná Kon, flight of the Moguls from Tartary to, 85; probable identity of, with India, 85; departure of the Moguls from, 85.

Isis, the wife of Osiris, 112; inscription in the temple of, 119.

Israelites, the, in Egypt, 116; departure of the, from Egypt, 117; the Egyptians sent in pursuit of the, 117.

Italy, general description of, 146; first inhabitants of, 146, 159; assertions of the sacred writers regarding, 147, 159; ancient history of, 147; traditions of the deluge in, 159; indigenous planting of, 159.

Ismatacen, father of Chinese history, 30, 91.

JARÁSANDHA, of Magadha, reign of, 40; war of, with Krishna and the Pándavas, 40.

Jemahood, of Persia, reign of, 56; invention of useful arts by, 56, 68; division of the people into classes by, 56, 68; proclaims himself a god, 56; defeated and killed by Zohauk, 56; first legislator of Persia, 69.

Jews, history of the, 100; assumption of martial character by the, 101; prosperity and civilisation of the, in the reign of Solomon, 102; separation of the different tribes of the, and formation of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, 102; ten tribes of the, carried into captivity by Sargon, 102; two remaining tribes of the, carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, 102; return of the, to Palestine, 103; subjection of the, successively to Persia, Alexander and his successors, and the Romans, 103; revolts of the, and storming of Jerusalem, 103; dispersion of the, 103; constant interference of God on behalf of the, 103; constant defection of the, from God, 103.

Jewish books, their character as guides in remote antiquity, 3.

Julius Caesar, election of, as consul and perpetual dictator, 155; murder of, 155.

KAIOMURS, of Persia, reign of, 55; recognised by some as a grandson of Noah, 55; fight of, with an army of magicians, 55; resignation of the throne by, 56; apparently a chief of the Tartars, 68.

Káliphat, succession of the, to both the spiritual and secular powers of Mahomet, 107; extension of conquest and conversion by, 107.

Kanauj, establishment of a kingdom at, by the Ráhtores under Báadeo, 47; ruled over in the tenth century by Virasingha, 48; Jaya Chandra, the last king of, defeated by the Mahomedans, 48.

Kawáh, conqueror of Zohauk, 57; apron of, converted into the royal standard of Persia, 57, 66; the standard captured by the Arabs, 66.

Kin Tartars, their incursions in China, 23.

Kublai Khán, conquest of China by, 24, 87; extent of the dominions of, 25; government of, 25.

LABYRINTH in Egypt, 116.

Leuhow, first female sovereign of China, 19; her character, 19.

Loeria, history of, 136.

Lunar race of India, account of, 39.

Lycurgus, improvements introduced in Sparta by, 135.

Lydia, 79.

Lydia, general description of, 79; history of, 79; planting of, 81; government of, 81; character, religion, manners, and customs of the people of, 81; disgraceful custom peculiar to the people of, 81.

MACEDON, history of, 135, 140, 141.

Magadha, account of, 37, 40, 44; reign of the Andhra Rájás over, 46.

Mahábool of Persia, identified at random with Belus and Mahá-Bali, 55.

Mahábud of Persia and his successors of the same name, 55.

Mahomet, birth of, in the time of Noshirwán of Persia, 65; doctrine preached by, 107; flight of, from Meccá, 107; favourable reception of, in Mediná, 107; extension of spiritual and temporal power by, over all Arabia, 107.

Maiden tribute, paid by the Chinese to the Huns and Tartars, 19, 23; refused by Wooté, 19, 24.

Mangtazé, the Chinese philosopher, birth of, 18.

Mantchoo Tartars, conquest of China by, 26.

Marathon, battle of, 138.

Media, 76.

Media, general description of, 76; history of, 77; overrun by the Scythians, 77; Scythians massacred in, by stratagem, 78; five years' war of, with Lydia amicably settled, 78, 80; succession of Cyrus to the throne of, 78; antiquity of, 78; planting of, 78; crime and effeminacy of the people of, 79.

Memphis, account of, 116.

Moeris, lake, in Egypt, 116.

Mogul, ingenious derivation of the name from Magog, 87.

Mogula, the, invited to assist the Chinese against the Kin Tartars, 23; their conquests, 24; complete conquest of China by, 25; character of the rule of, in China, 25; overthrow of the rule of, in China, 26.

Mosaic account of the creation, the, 6; difference of the, with other accounts, 7.

Mulook-u-Tusif, or commonwealth of tribes in Persia, 63.

Mycalé, naval battle off, 139.

NANDA, accounts of, 44; murder of, 44.

National traditions, value of, 3.

Navigation, knowledge of, before the flood, 92, 142, 169.

Necho, of Egypt, reign of, 119; circumnavigation of Africa under the orders of, 119.

Nimrod, account of, 72.

Nineveh, kings of, 74.

Ninus, account of, 72; conquest of Bactria by, 73.

Noshirwán the Just, or Chosroes I., reign of, 65; reorganization of the government of Persia by, 65; wars of, with three Roman Emperors, 65; conquests of, in Tartary, India, and Arabia, 65.

OANNES, teacher of letters in Assyria, 71.

Obelisks in Egypt, 116.

Octavius Caesar, appointed consul for life, Augustus, and Emperor, 155; literary brilliancy of the era of, 155.

Oghus Khán, conquest of China by, 27; invasion of India by, 42; sons of, and their supposed connection with the Solar and Lunar races of India, 42, 50, 85; confounded with Og, king of Bashan, 84; wars of, for the extermination of idolatry, 84, 178; conquests of, 84.

Osiris, of Egypt, history of, 112, 123.

Osymandyas, or Osertesen I., of Egypt, reign of, 115; inscription regarding, 115.

PALESTINE, 99.

Palestine, general description of, 99; Abraham called to occupy, under a promise, 99; occupation of, by the Jews, 101; government of, as a republic, 101; introduction of kingly rule in, 101; prosperity and civilisation of, in the reign of Solomon, 102; division of, into two states, 102; subsequent history of, 102; subjection of, to Persia, 103; subjection of, to Alexander and his successors, 103; subjection of, to the Romans, 103; revolts in, and destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the people, 103.

Parthian era, divisions of the, 63.

Pelagi, character of the, 129, 136.

PERSIA, 54.

Persia, general description of, 54; divisions of the history of, 54; ancient history of, 54; internecine war in, for the punishment of general wickedness, 55, 67; invention of arts in, 56; reading and writing learnt in, 56; division of the people of, into four classes, 56; conquest of, by Zohauk, 56; liberation of, from foreign yoke by Kawâh, 57; conquest of, by Áfrásâib, 57; liberation of, by Zâl, 57; second and third invasions of, by Áfrásâib, 57; union of, with Media under Cyrus, 58; Magian attempt to replace a Median on the throne of, 59; elevation of Darius Hystaspes to the throne of, 59; the wars of, with Greece, 60, 61, 138; decline of, 62; conquest of, by Alexander the Great, 62; foundation of the Parthian dynasty in, 63; divisions of the Parthian era of, 63; foundation of the Sassanian dynasty in, 63; reorganisation of the government of, by Noshirwân, or Chosroes I., 65; breakdown of, after the death of Noshirwân, 65; Arab attacks and conquest of, 66; version of Josephus and the Bible in respect to, 66; planting of, by the Tartars, 68; early civilisation of, 68; system of government established by Jemsheed in, 69; government of, under Darius Hystaspes, 69; manners and habits of the people of, 69; religion of the people of, 70; literature of, 70; résumé of the history of, 172.

Persian Court, morals of the, 61.

Persians, manners and habits of the, 69, 70; their name for hardihood, 69; result of contact of the, with the Greeks, 69; religion of the, 70.

PHENICIA, SYRIA, PALESTINE, AND ARABIA, 91.**Phœnicia, 91.**

Phœnicia, general description of, 91; history of, as given by Sanchoniatho, 91; history of, as given by the Greeks, 93; principal states of, 93; the deluge not known in, 95; peopling of, 95; early civilisation of, 96; résumé of the history of, 174.

Phœnicians, position of the, as merchants and navigators, 96; establishment of settlements by the, 96; service rendered by the, to civilisation, 96; the Cape of Good Hope doubled by the, 97; the coasts of Britain and the shores of the Baltic visited by the, 97.

Plataea, battle of, 139.

Population, indigenous to the soil, theory of, explained, 88.

Porus, of India, his engagement with Alexander the Great, 43.

PREFATORY REMARKS, I.

Primitive races, opposite phases in the condition of the, 167; institution of the restraints and ordinances of society among the, 167; discoveries in arts and inventions useful to life by the, 168, 179; appearance of turbulence

and discord among the, 168; longevity of the, 179; size and strength of the, 179.

Printing, discovery of, in China, 19.

Pwankoo, first sovereign of China, 15.

Pyramids in Egypt, the, 116, 118, 124, 175.

RED SEA, drying up of the, 101.

Résumé, 164.

Rhea Sylvia, story of, 148.

ROME, 146.

Rome, foundation of, 148; administrative arrangements of Romulus in, 149; rape of Sabine women for augmenting the population of, 150; reign of the successors of Romulus in, 150; completion of administrative arrangements by Servius Tullius in, 151; abolition of royalty in, 151; dissensions between the patricians and plebeians in, 151; appointment of decemvirs in, 152; abolition of the decemvirate in, 152; continuation of the discords between the patricians and plebeians in, 152; foreign wars waged by, 152; revival of internal contentions in, 153; quarrels between Marius and Sylla, Julius Caesar and Pompey, and Antony and Octavius Caesar for supremacy in, 154; Augustus emperor of, and brilliancy of the Augustan era, 155; infamous emperors of, 155; extinction of the house of Caesar in, 155; Domitian the worst tyrant of, 156; the five good emperors of, 156; sale of, by the prætorian guards, 156; pressure of barbarians upon, 157; removal of the seat of empire from, to Constantinople, 157; conquest of, by the Heruli, 158; chief features of the history of, 160; republican government of, 160; strength of, how consolidated and increased, 161; decline of, how facilitated, 161; different stages of government in, reviewed, 162; religion of the people of, 163; literature and civilisation of, 163; résumé of the history of, 175, 177.

Roman Empire, commencement of the, with the reign of Augustus Caesar, 155; decline of the, after the age of the Antonines, 156; division of the, between Arcadius and Honorius, 158; destruction of the, 158.

Romulus, reign of, 149.

Romulus and Remus, story of, 148.

Roostum, the great hero of Persian story, 57; encounter of, with his son Sohrab, 57.

SĀGARA, use of *agni-astram*, or firearms, by, against the Scythians, 41.

Salamis, naval battle of, 139.

Salivāhana, his victory over Vikramāditya, 46.

Sanchoniatho, account of the creation by, 7.

Sanskrit literature, three eras of, 45.

Satyavratā, the contemporary of Noah in India, 35.

Schironeh, the parricide, reign of, in Persia, 66; misdeeds of, 66.

Scythic tribes, enumeration of the, 82; Josephus's account of the, 87; exercise of authority over the, 89; laws of the, 89; character of the, 90; religion of the, 90.

Semiramis, invasion of India by, 41, 73; defeated by Stabrobates, 41, 73; particulars regarding, 73; murder of, 73; licentious life of, 73; inscription relating to, 74; alleged identity of, with Shāmā Devi of India, 74.

- Sesostriæ, or Sestesura, invasion of India by, 41; reign of, 117; conquests of, 117; worthiness of, 117; death of, 118.
- Sharma and Jayapati, names of, given at random to the son of Satyavratâ, 38, 49.
- Shishak, or Bacchus, conquest of India by, 41, 118; Spartembas placed on the throne of India by, 41; erroneously identified with Sâkya Muni, 41; mention of in the Bible, 118.
- Sicyon, history of, 129.
- Sidon, history of, 93.
- Solar race of India, account of the, 38.
- Solomon, appearance of God to, in a dream, 102.
- Solon, court of Areopagus improved by, 130, 132; code of laws given to Athens by, 131.
- Sparta, history of, 134; wars of, with Athens, 138, 139; supremacy of, subverted by the Thebans, 140.
- Sun, no setting of the, in China, for ten days, 15.
- Sylla, elevation of, to the dictatorship, 154; abdication of the dictatorship by, 154.
- Syria, 97.
- Syria, general description of, 97; principal states of, 97; history of, 97; colonisation of, 98; government of, 98; character of the people of, 99; religion of, 99; civilisation of, 99.

TÂHÂMURS, of Persia, knowledge of letters acquired by, from magicians, 56.
Tartary, 81.

Tartary, general description of, 81; tribes of, and their nomad habits, 82; Scythic kings of, 82; Turk, Tartar, and Mogul kings of, 84; wars between the Tartars and Moguls in, 84, 85; subversion of the Mogul power in, 85; flight of the Moguls from, to Irgânâ Kon, 85; return of the Moguls to, 85; planting of, 87; prolificness of, 88; known as *terra incognita* by the ancients, 88; exercise of authority in, 89; laws of, 89; character of the people of, 90; religion of the people of, 90; résumé of the history of, 174.

Tartars, character of the military and colonising expeditions of the, 171, 174; habits of the, 171.

Tartar invasions of China referred to by Father Martini, 18, 26.

Tartar, or Scythic irruptions, in China, 17, 20, 23; in India, 41, 42; in Persia, 57; in Media, 77.

Thebes, account of, 115.

Thermopylæ, battle of, 139.

Thessaly, history of, 133.

Thomyris, queen of the Massagetae, offer of marriage made to, by Cyrus, 83; war of Cyrus with, 83.

Traditions, national, value of, 3.

Tribunal of history in China, and its labours, 30.

Turks, their desire to settle in China, 22; bought off by bribes, 22; establishment of their present dominions by the, 22.

Typhon, understood to mean a deluge, 113; resemblance of the name to the word "Toofân," or tempest at sea, 113.

Tyre, history of, 94.

VIKRAMĀDITYA, era of, 45; nine gems in the court of, 45, and note; arrest of Scythic inroads into India by, 45; defeated and slain by Salivāhana, 46.

WESTERN EMPIRE, destruction of the, in the reign of Augustus Romulus, 158.

World, idea regarding the planting of the, by Noah and his descendants, 4, 8; other theories regarding the planting of the, 9; conclusion on the peopling of the, 166, 167.

Writing, discovery of the art of, 169.

XERXES, wars of, with Greece, 60; defeat of, 60, 139; licentious life of, and death, 61.

YAOU, reign of, 15; the first legislator of China, 30.

Yu, founder of the Hea dynasty in China, reign of, 16; administrative arrangements of, 16.

ZORHAUK, conquest of Persia by, 56; cruelty of, 57; captured and killed by Kawáh, a blacksmith, 57.

Zoroaster, religion of, in Persia, 60, 64, 70.

THE MODERN WORLD.*

CHAPTER I.

PREFATORY REMARKS.

THE best study of man is the future of mankind, and to qualify for that study it is necessary to know the history of the past. We have already spoken of the Ancient World; it is our purpose now to speak of the Modern World, so remarkable for its political changes and intellectual revolutions. To read it aright we must read the history of its growth; but that does not necessarily imply that we must burden ourselves with a multitude of facts, names, and dates, a dry collection of which will never be palatable to the general reader. The facts in detail are fully set forth in special histories, which are always accessible for reference. The aim we have in view is to present to the reader such a selection of items from them as will give a telescopic view of the world as we find it, explaining the phases it has passed through. In such an attempt it will be necessary, of course, to allude to the projecting or turning points of general history, and to the memorable events of all times and places which have contributed to the development of the nations that exist; but it will be necessary, at the same time, to shorten the pictures by abridgment, and to omit not only events and deeds of secondary importance, but also all the unnecessary adjuncts

* The political state of the world has undergone some changes since this portion of the work was first published in 1876; but we have not so revised it as to include every change that has taken place.

appertaining to deeds of primary magnitude. The multitude of facts to pick from is immense ; but we must not get entangled among them. We want those particulars only that elucidate the dependence of the different countries on each other, and account for their present relative positions. The history of England is, or ought to be, familiar to all our readers, and no regular narration of events relating to it will therefore be attempted. But some cursory allusion to the principal events of other countries must be made, since the English reader generally is not very conversant with them.

The main points of our inquiry, it will be understood, are the progress of liberty and the diffusion of civilisation, which virtually comprise the history of modern times. Absolute freedom nowhere exists ; it is an indefinite term that does not admit of complete realization. But every nation carries with it the principle or capacity of development, and the results compassed by such development are freedom, civilisation, and happiness, in greater or less degree. In the ancient world civilisation was well attained, but not freedom, till we come to the times of Greece and Rome. In the modern world, both civilisation and freedom have been better attained in all places, even where much of political liberty has not yet been acquired. The civilisation of the modern world is also of a higher standard than that which was attained in the past, the latter having been founded on universal abasement, while the former is established on universal advancement ; but genius, talent, and virtue were met with in as much abundance in the old world as they have yet been in the new. The knowledge of the modern world differs from that of the ancient world mainly in this, that it is more extensively diffused, the earth having become man's more fully now than it ever was before. He has bridged over its seas and scaled its mountains ; traversed its wildest and most arid plains ; explored its remotest inlets and islands, even unto the poles. The knowledge of the ancients permeated only through the countries which were known to them—namely,

the southern portions of Asia, the south-eastern countries of Europe, and the north-eastern corner of Africa. But now geography has mastered all the secrets of *terra incognita*, and the pushing civilisation of the age has made every part of the globe accessible by railways, bridges, and canals. The Suez Canal, the Thames Tunnel, the bridges over the Menai Straits and the St. Lawrence, are stupendous works which have been multiplied in minor dimensions in every direction. The lightning-post has traversed every part of Europe and the United States, and is rapidly crossing Australasia, India, and the extremities of the earth generally, all of which are being daily more closely connected with Europe. The network of railways has received almost equal expansion; and the result of these advances is, that the standard of humanity has been raised everywhere by the acceleration of intercourse between the different races inhabiting the earth, and by the relief of material want by the utilization of the surplusage of one place for the benefit of another. It is a common saying, that all in Europe are now in the presence of each other; nor are America, India, and Australasia more distant on account of the seas that intervene between them. Within an interval of twenty-two days the latest new novel published in London or Paris finds its way out into the hands of the Hindu reader on the banks of the Brahmapootra; and day by day the electric wire doles out the most important items of intelligence from all the great centres of civilisation to the outermost confines of the globe.

Taking the two divisions of the world, the old and the new, together, the course of progress is seen to have travelled from east to west—from Asia to Europe, and thence across the Atlantic to America. It has since diverged towards the south and south-east—to Africa, Australasia, and the islands in the Indian Ocean; while the West, originally a borrower, is repaying to the East her deep debt of gratitude by communicating to her all her recent discoveries and refinements. The footsteps of this

development it will not be an unpleasant or unremunerative task to trace. The point to start from is the line of demarcation between the histories of the old world and the new, which is broadly defined by the migration of nations from Asia to Europe, by which the Roman world was upset, and of which the cause has not yet been correctly understood. The races in Europe previous to this era were the Celts, the Goths, and the Slavs; the first of whom inhabited Britain, France, a part of Spain, a part of Italy, and the Alps; the second, Germany and Scandinavia; the third, all the countries to the East. It is believed that the Goths migrated from Europe to Asia, but were brought back by the rushing hordes which a short time afterwards precipitated themselves westwards, and compelled all before them to reoccupy their own original quarters to escape being ridden over. The effects of this general hurricane were anarchy and confusion, followed by an intermixture of nations and the establishment of new kingdoms, the first kingdom established being that of the Suevi and the Vandals in Spain, which was overturned by the Visigoths: the second, the kingdom of the Franks in Gaul; the third, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy, which was subverted by the Lombards; the fourth, the kingdom of the Burgundians, which lay between France and Germany; and the fifth, the kingdom established by the Anglo-Saxons in Britain. Germany became the seat of the residuum of the barbarians, including the Goths; while the Scandinavians, a section of the latter race originally established on the shores of the Baltic, spread themselves out, first, as Normans, into France and Britain, and generally all over Europe, and next, as Varangians, into Russia, where they founded the Russian empire on the Slavonian stem. The immediate results of these changes were the Dark and the Middle Ages; but their ulterior effects have made Europe to flourish anew, called forth the energies of new nations and countries, led to the discovery of new lands, and in the place of one Persia, one Greece, and one Rome, developed several nations, at one and the

same time, almost to an equality of civilisation, power, and greatness. They have done even more than this, for they have destroyed the isolation of nations. All over the world, Englishmen, Germans, and Americans are now domiciled almost in every place; and in Europe the different nationalities are constantly intermingling and verging to a fusion of blood and interests. At the same time, the products of the different countries are being freely interchanged, wildernesses are being converted into blooming gardens, mountains clothed with vegetation, climates and temperatures improved, and civilisation transferred from one extremity of the earth to another. The changes effected have been already so considerable, that, while the greatest difficulty was experienced in the past by the boldest men of one country in visiting another without a strong retinue, European females now make the circuit of the globe by themselves, without needing any special protection. The Hindu, who could not cross the Indus or venture on the ocean before without loss of caste, is now constantly passing backwards and forwards from India to Great Britain; and English sportsmen conduct their hunting expeditions in the wilds of Africa and South America, or ramble for pleasure across the steppés of Central Asia.

This is one side of the picture—namely, the favourable side; but it is not the only phase we have to consider. If an extraordinary degree of similarity and contiguity have been arrived at, absolute sameness, or anything near to it, has not been attained. Liberty has grown largely everywhere; but yet are not all countries equally free. The increased intercourse and connection of races have civilised them all round to a great extent; but still are not all races equally civilised. The civilisation of the American and the Russian is not quite on a par with the civilisation of the Englishman and the Frenchman; and the civilisation of the Magyar and the Turk is yet lower in degree. The diversities that yet exist are, in fact, as striking as the resemblances which have been attained. Each country has

still a marked speciality to distinguish it from others, and this is observable even in those that are nearly akin. England and America, which ought to resemble most, are sundered alike by the Atlantic and the strong peculiarities and prejudices which distinguish them from each other. France and England are next-door neighbours, approaching nearest in civilisation and refinement, but disunited more by their respective notions of liberty and their historic associations, than by the small channel that runs between them. Germany, Austria, and Russia are all despotic governments, but totally differing from each other in their despotism: the autocrats of Germany and Austria, for instance, can both, like the Czar, set large armies in motion by their orders, but they cannot, as he can, set their peoples also in motion. Whence do these diversities in the midst of so much resemblance arise? Civil and political liberty have been best attained in England and America, yet are not their governments similarly constituted. In a lower degree they have also been attained in Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy; but France, which has struggled for them most frantically, has not yet been able to secure them. In Germany the struggle for them has yet to come, and threatens more commotions in the future than any that has yet convulsed her. Russia will probably have to wait a hundred years more before she gets them. Turkey will have ceased to exist before the possibility of her securing them can arise. Why is this so? Why in the midst of so much outward resemblance are some nations free and prosperous, while others, their nearest neighbours, are unprosperous and in bonds?

This invites particular attention to the fact that even now nothing is more diverse than the genius of the different nations, notwithstanding their near resemblance in outward civilisation. We have said already that much progress has been lately made on all sides towards the attainment of liberty and refinement; but very different are the ways in which the same ends have been sought for, very different the appliances used in attaining them. Of

course. every nation has a time—and if it be of the right sort, not one time only—to develop itself fully; but, as liberty and greatness grow, and are not acquired, it depends mainly on the character of the people how their growth is directed, and whether that growth shall be stunted or luxuriant. In general acceptance the republican form of government is regarded as the most free; and so it has been found in the United States, in Holland, and in Switzerland. But it does not equally suit the character of all nations, and in several places the monarchical form has been preferred, as being in all respects more convenient without being less free. England, the freest country in the world, is monarchical; while Spain, the country of brigands and ruffians, was recently, for some time at least, a republic. All America, with the exception of Canada and Brazil, is republican; but, barring the United States, the republics everywhere are based entirely on military force, and are necessarily subject to constant revolutions, and not in any sense free. No two constitutions anywhere are precisely alike; nor do the teachings of the past inculcate that they should be so. The actions of men proceed from their need; that need varies according to time and place, and still more according to the views entertained of it in different places: the actions necessarily are different, and the results dissimilar. The need, moreover, is often, very often, misinterpreted and misdirected by passions and private aims, to which the greatness of nations, the wisdom of states, and the wellbeing of administrations are unhesitatingly and unscrupulously sacrificed. Few, very few, are the states in which passions and private aims cannot thus be gratified at the expense of the general weal. Such being the diversities that influence mankind, it is not strange that the results are so dissimilar.

Nor does the contest for greatness and liberty suit all states, at least at all times; and it is certain that nations are not necessarily wretched because they happen to be less great or less free. As in individual, so in national life, a limited sphere of action seems often to afford a greater

degree of wellbeing, if not of happiness, than the most unbounded freedom. A shepherd or a peasant is not less happy than a prime-minister or a prince; and intrinsically the Swedes and the Danes are not less well-off than the English or the French. It is the necessary fate of Asiatic nations to be subject to the domination of Europeans; and India is held by the English, and all Siberia by the Russians. Their dependence doubtless is to them a political misfortune, but they are really happier in it than they ever were in their freedom. If they could be both happy and free, which would be the case if they were also powerful, that would doubtless be the best state for them. But under existing circumstances they are not unhappy; and, in the case of Egypt, it is doubtful if she is not happier than the sovereign state. The development of nations requires a perpetual change of position, but for states in the condition of Siberia and India, a course of dependence, when it secures rest and peace, is apparently better suited. Even progress itself pursues its onward course most frequently through convulsions; but, for progress to be so attained, all countries are not equally qualified. That qualification must be acquired; and it can only be acquired by a preparative course of rest, which is therefore not dear even when it is purchased by subjection.

States of the above description, however, will require little attention in our present inquiry, which will mainly embrace the states of Europe, which are all more or less free. America in such a review stands but as an offshoot of Europe, and will be noticed only as such. The old races in it, treated with violence, have nearly died out, except in South America, where the Spaniards and the Portuguese intermixed with them and raised up a spurious breed. This distinction deserves to be remembered. The whole of North America, with the exception of Mexico and the states to the south of it, has been colonised by immigrants from Europe, and the native Americans extirpated; the whole of South America, and Mexico in North America, were conquered, and the native races—though treated with

unusual atrocity—were not exterminated. Regarding Africa there is little to mention, as it scarcely forms a historical part of the world yet, having no movement or development to exhibit except in the coast-land on the north, the history of which belongs to the histories of Europe and Asia. Of Asia, also, the account to be given must necessarily be slender, as the destiny of this continent in the modern world is generally that of subjection to Europe, which Russia, at least, is working out with untiring pertinacity. The independent states in Asia are the effete ones of the ancient world, to which a very cursory allusion only need be made. Of all countries the general spirit and political formation merely will be noticed, and those events which have created an epoch or changed the aspect and aspirations of the people.

CHAPTER II.

GREAT BRITAIN.

GREAT BRITAIN occupies a very insignificant position in the map of the world, but there is no part of that map to which her dominion does not extend. Let the reader spread out before him the chart of the two hemispheres and run his eye over all the strategical points therein, and he will find that almost all of them are held by the Mistress of the Seas. They have been won for her by her soldiers and sailors in the quietest manner possible, and virtually secure to her an almost universal dominion, which places her foremost in the scale of empires. With this material superiority she has also secured a moral pre-eminence of a yet higher character. Her institutions are generally held to be the best in the world, her government the least faulty; and thus well-balanced at home and abroad, she retains a steadfast position, unaffected by political storms either from without or within. True liberty, which is bragged of everywhere, is domiciled only within the seas which gird the British Isles. Dethroned princes, runaway potentates, persecuted ministers and patriots, exiles of every description, flock to them from all parts of the world, for that security and peace which other countries boast of but are unable to afford.

The history of such a country could not but be instructive, and perhaps the history of no other country has been better read. One great truth established by it is, that the growth of excellence is slow, and systematical even from the outset. Those who choose to do so, may also trace in it the hand of Providence regulating the growth at every stage. If the Jews in ancient times were a peculiarly favoured people, so in modern times have been the English;

though that favour has been manifested, as is usual with the dispensations of Providence, in the midst of storms and convulsions, which purified the atmosphere of their island home. We cannot stop to notice the history of this progress step by step as it was developed; it will be enough for our purpose to indicate the more important landmarks by which it is to be traced.

The fabulous history of Britain begins with the colonisation of the island by Bruto or Brute, the grandson of Æneas, who is said to have been succeeded by a long line of descendants. Of these, however, we have no historic knowledge. The first known inhabitants of the island were the Celts, who were seen in it by the Phœnicians when they came to it for tin. These aborigines are generally set down as having been very barbarous, but erroneously, since we find that they were collected in political communities under the government of a king, had a national religion, and were possessed of some knowledge of philosophy, astronomy, and medicine. They are represented on all hands as having been very brave, and as having given the Romans a warm reception on their first invasion of Britain, which so astonished the legions of Cæsar, that, contrary to their usual behaviour, they betrayed a dislike to continue the fight. It was only when Mandubratius, a traitor, fled over subsequently to Gaul, and thereby created a division among the Britons, that the arts, not valour, of Cæsar, prevailed; but there is no doubt that at the outset Cæsar was fairly beaten, since Suetonius, himself a Roman general, admits that it was so. Nor were the Celts of England finally conquered till one hundred and forty years after, by Agricola, in the reign of Domitian; while the Celts of Scotland, the Picts and Scots, were never subdued.

The history of this period, however, is not the history of the English people, who were of later growth. The decline of the Roman empire compelled the Romans to abandon Britain after a sway of about four hundred and seventy years. The Picts and Scots, who had always been trouble-

some to their southern neighbours, molested them now to such an extent that Vortigern was obliged to apply to the Saxons for aid. The assistance asked for was given; the Picts and Scots were defeated: but the Saxons throve so well in the land they had come to, that, far from retiring from it themselves, they began to invite over fresh hordes from the forests of Germany, which finally enabled them to establish their dominion from the Thames to the Tamar, and compelled the Britons to retire into Wales.

England derives her name from Anglen, a district of Holstein, the home of the Angles, a fierce people, the traces of whose character may yet be observed in that of the English of the present day. There were three German tribes that came over to the island almost simultaneously—namely, the Angles and Jutes from the south of Denmark, and the Saxons from the north of Germany. All these were afterwards classified under the general name of Anglo-Saxons. They were all brave and hardy, and had been noted from the earliest times for their piracies at sea, and for the havoc they frequently made on the coasts of Britain and France; but it nevertheless took them one hundred and fifty years to establish their authority completely in Britain, during the whole of which period they were obliged to keep up a perpetual warfare with the Celts. It is in connection with these disturbances that the fables regarding Arthur and his knights are told.

After the conquest of the country, the different Saxon hordes divided it into seven distinct principalities, each setting up a ruler of its own; and this division was called the Heptarchy, the kings of which only nominally acknowledged one of their number as their *Brætwalda*, or chief. This arrangement remained in force for upwards of two hundred years, after which Egbert, king of Wessex, united the different states into one monarchy. The other great sovereigns of the race were Alfred, Athelstane, Edgar, and Harold. The whole of the Saxon era was one of great unrest. In the reign of Egbert began the invasions of the Danes, a nation of pirates, who committed dreadful ravages

on the coast of Britain; and at about the same time the Northmen or Normans, another horde from the same hive, infested the north-west coast of France, where they eventually settled. The Danes received a temporary check from the tact and vigour of Alfred, who obliged them to leave the country or to acknowledge his supremacy, which led to their settlement in Mercia and East Anglia. Their insolence culminated in the invasion of England by Sweyn in 1013, and the succession of his son Canute to the throne. Canute was succeeded by two other Danish princes, after whom the Saxon line was restored, in 1041, by the succession of Edward the Confessor. Harold succeeded Edward, but with no valid title to the crown, which was, within a very short time, wrenched from him by William of Normandy.

The Normans wrested the possession of the country from the Saxons; but the Normans were not Franks, nor the Saxons or Anglo-Saxons identical with the English nation as it was afterwards developed. Hume says that, by the time of William, the Normans had thoroughly mingled with the Franks. This they had doubtless done, as well by intermarriage as by the adoption of the language, religion, and usages of the Franks; but, nevertheless, the invaders of England were not French, nor even of mixed descent. Macaulay, in his usual dogmatical manner, speaks of the *French* kings of England; but they were no more French than Huns: they were Scandinavians born on French soil. The remarks of Schlegel on the point are very pertinent. He correctly observes that, though the Normans adopted the French language, "in mind and manners they retained their individuality throughout the whole of the Middle Ages; so that at that time the Normans and the French, even when speaking the same language, must by no means be regarded as one, but as two very distinct nations." The English, again, are a mixed race, derived from the fusion of the Celts, Anglo-Saxons, Danes, and Normans. The *bonâ fide* English nation was therefore not in existence when the battle of Hastings was fought. All that can be conceded

to without demur comes therefore to this, that the people who inhabited the north-west coast of France defeated the people who inhabited England in 1066 ; but whether that implies the glorification of the French nation at the expense of the English is a very different question.

The conquest made by the Normans was not an easy one, and but for adventitious circumstances would perhaps never have been achieved. The invaders crossed an undefended sea, to land on an undefended shore, Harold having been obliged to withdraw both his army and his navy from the southern coast to repel an invasion in the north made by Hadrada, king of Norway. When, after having defeated one enemy, he came back to repel the other, his army was numerically so inferior to that of the invaders, that his best captains advised him to fall back upon London, and, by laying waste the country about it, starve the Normans, also giving time thereby to the Saxon fleet to reassemble and intercept communication with Normandy. But Harold's blood was up, and his kindly heart rejected the idea of laying any part of the country waste : and it was for these reasons that the battle of Hastings was lost.

Conquest to a brave people is a bitter draught. The sense of foreign domination weighed heavily on the Saxons, and the violence of the Normans made matters worse. The consequence was that fierce local risings were constant, and were followed by revengeful cruelties on the part of the conquerors. William himself followed a remorseless policy, the object held in view by him being the annihilation of the Saxons as a distinct race. His efforts to crush them out were, however, unsuccessful ; they only kept up bitter feuds and jealousies between the two parties in the state.

Notwithstanding all this, however, the Norman Conquest was not without its advantages. Previous to it England had no recognised position in Europe. The Romans had ruled as conquerors, keeping themselves distinct from the people they conquered, whom they compensated by protection and by instruction in their laws and institutions—somewhat in the way in which the English are now

civilising their subject races in India. The Saxons, who came after them, mixed with the Celts freely, but were at best half-savages themselves; and almost throughout the whole period of their ascendancy there was nothing but strife, waste, and turbulence. Compared with those periods the era of the Normans does not suffer. In it the conquerors ruled indeed with a rod of iron, trampled roughshod over the feelings of the races they had conquered, and tried by every means in their power to root them out at least from a political existence. But they brought with them a civilisation superior to that of the Saxons; they had derived from the Franks a better cultivated language; and they had also acquired from that nation a knowledge of useful and tasteful arts. They were not very anxious, it is true, to advance the condition of the people they had conquered; but having assumed the sovereignty of the country for good, they, for their own advantage, began to improve and beautify it, by better cultivation, and by the erection of permanent works of usefulness and embellishment; while, for securing a better hold on the land, they introduced their own language, or rather Norman-French, as the language of government, of the law courts, and of the upper classes generally, which, if it caused a confusion of languages at first, was beneficial in the end in this way, that it made the refinements of the Franks accessible at least to people of the higher classes in Britain.

The Saxons were a barbarous people, in some respects even more barbarous than the Celts they had conquered. But they introduced popular institutions, and brought with them those notions of equal rights which they held in common with all the German nations. This was the indelible mark they left on the land. The constitution of the Wittenagemot is not exactly known. It may be admitted that it was not a representative body, but it was assuredly the nearest approach to representation that could have been expected in that age. It was an assembly of thanes who held lands immediately of the Crown, and who could command the services of their military vassals.

These thanes elected the king, and their assent was also necessary to give effect to all legislative enactments, since, except with their acquiescence and support, the kings had no hold whatever on the people. It is said that similar assemblies existed even among the Britons, which were called *Fahring brat* or *Combdach*. But the Saxon Wittenagemot was at least a better recognised institution, with greater powers. Under the Normans the form was continued, the assemblies assuming the Latin titles of *concilium* or *curia*; but their powers were very much curtailed. The parliamentary form of government in England was therefore coeval with political government, though, of course, the institution was not at all times equally free. Under the Saxons the thanes often exercised immeasurable power,—as was the case with Godwin, Harold, and Siward; but the commons were not ignored. The rule of the Normans was more despotic; the commons were nowhere, and even the barons exercised such power only as they were able to usurp.

At the close of the first five hundred years of her existence the progress of England was confined to the impressions left on her by her Roman masters; in the next five hundred years were engrafted on them the free institutions of the Anglo-Saxons. In the succeeding five hundred years she passed through the semi-barbarism of Norman domination, at the end of which she reached the confines of civilisation. But the impress of the Normans was not the less necessary to form the national character. The feudal system in its matured state was introduced by the Normans. By it the lands were partly retained by the Crown, and partly divided among the great military leaders, on the condition of their attending on the king in his wars. This change was apparently a retrograde one; it introduced a new race of paramount landlords by dispossessing the former owners of the soil; the possessions of an entire community were sequestered, and the peasantry disposed of as villeins and serfs, going with the estate on which they were settled; a large number of petty tyrants were formally

established, who virtually exercised sovereign power within their estates under the general control of the king. But, on the other hand, it also inaugurated order, property, and civil subordination, and consolidated a number of petty, antagonistic states into one powerful kingdom, having one recognised head, one law, one language, and one supreme legislature. The spirit of popular liberty had been previously derived from the Saxons; the framework of polity had been borrowed from the Romans: it was left to the Normans to convert a federal community into an integral kingdom, and to consolidate it by insuring social subordination and proprietary security; both which advantages were by the feudal system fully attained.

The Norman reign lasted for four hundred and twenty years. At the outset the monarchs were absolute, having nothing to fear except the greatness of their own vassals, the iron barons they had called forth, who met in council when summoned by the king to give their advice and consent on matters which were laid before them, but who did not at this stage exercise any direct control over him. The weakness and tyranny of one of the sovereigns, John, changed this state of affairs. The barons, driven to rebellion, extorted from him great concessions, which were embodied in what was called the *Magna Charta*, as distinguished from other minor charters previously granted by his predecessors, which conceded particular privileges to some of the greater vassals and churchmen of the State. The charter now obtained secured for the first time all orders of the people in their rights and privileges; the monarchy of the country was declared by it to be limited; and it was expressly provided that no taxes were to be levied from the people, except in a few special cases, without the consent of the general council of the barons and the clergy, that all cities and boroughs were to be allowed to preserve their ancient liberties, that no person was to be tried on suspicion alone, and that no person was to be tried or punished except by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the laws of the land. This, which was re-

garded at the time as a shameful violation of the royal prerogative, and which drew down upon it the thunders of the Vatican, has been since justly considered as the first chapter of the English constitution and the palladium of English liberty; nay, as the first broken rivet of human emancipation. The rate of progress in Britain was greatly accelerated by it. A considerable interval elapsed before the rights it conceded were fully established; but they were all established in due course. In the reign that immediately followed, the barons rose up again, and undertaking the task of reforming the constitution thoroughly, subverted the exclusive domination of the Crown and the chief nobles by introducing the principle of popular representation, which was practically exemplified by calling together the first Parliament, in which each city and borough was represented.

The Norman chiefs who obtained possession of England by conquest, also held territories in France under the vassalage of the French crown, the regal possession of Normandy having been surrendered in the reign of John, excepting that of the Norman isles—Jersey, Guernsey, and Alderney—which is held by England to this day. This gave poignancy to the fierce and protracted struggle for the phantom crown of France, which was commenced by Edward III., who based his claim in right of his mother, a princess of France. The contest was diversified by the splendid victories gained by the English at Cressy, Poitiers, Verneuil, and Agincourt; but it eventually ended in their entire expulsion from France, which was regarded by both the contending parties as an ignominious reverse for England, though it proved really to be a great gain to her by thenceforth concentrating all her energies to the development of her greatness, while, had the two crowns been united, England would probably never have had an independent existence. The fruits of the reverse were, however, not immediately reaped. Without any external enemy to fight with, the English barons began to quarrel among themselves, and Edward III. having left several

sons, a contest for the sovereign power between two of the royal branches divided the nobility and the people into two distinct parties, which carried on a sanguinary strife for upwards of thirty years, that was only terminated by the accession of Henry VII. to the throne. The results of these struggles were the almost entire annihilation of the power of the barons, and the extinction of villeinage, which liberated the aspirations of the people and enabled them to move forward and assume their proper place in the commonwealth.

The pacific era of the Tudors was very favourable to the growth of public prosperity. The elevation of the commons and the increase of authority of the king were both caused by the decline of the feudal and ecclesiastical orders, the latter of which was exhausted by its arrogance, at the same time that the former was annihilated by self-destructive feuds. The Tudor age is generally regarded as a very despotic one, and doubtless was so; but that despotism was prejudicial only to the interests of the upper classes, not to those of the people. The reign of Henry VII. terminated the period called the "Middle Ages," and ushered the world at large to greater light and freedom. In England, the reign of Elizabeth was particularly distinguished. In the Plantagenet period, it was the sword that had arbitrated on all doubtful occasions between the upper and the productive classes; at the commencement of the Protestant Reformation, persecution and the fagot assumed the place of arms; but a better era was inaugurated by the Reformation after it was accomplished, as it smoothed the way for other reforms by affording greater freedom to thought and discussion, and called forth the middle and productive classes into prominence. The wise and vigorous administration of Elizabeth gave scope and impulse to these movements by opening out new careers and new fields of enterprise to her subjects. A great impulse was given to mercantile adventures by the extraordinary geographical discoveries of the age. The exploits of Drake, Cavendish, Raleigh, Frobisher, and others, led to the establishment

of colonies and factories, and the opening out of new branches of commerce in distant and hitherto unknown lands. Commerce, which had till now been regarded with disdain by the generality of country gentlemen, and even by younger sons, who preferred to it a life of penury and dependence, became henceforth the rage, and was pursued by almost all classes with equal alacrity. This broke up the immense fortunes of the upper classes, which had, in previous eras, rendered them formidable alike to the king and the people; it also made the people richer, and necessarily more ambitious. The arms of the queen were, at the same time, victorious in distant lands, and Providence having destroyed the Spanish Armada on the English coast, the prestige of the English nation was thoroughly established, and, from a second-rate position, England assumed from this time the rank and status of a first-rate power. The era was also pre-eminently marked by the emancipation of letters. The touch of Prospero's wand England received from Shakspeare and Spenser; Raleigh was her first historian; and, in the following reign, Bacon emancipated philosophy from the fetters which had encumbered her.

The Stuart era that followed was not half so vigorous; and if it was characterized by the absence of external disturbances, that was mainly owing to the incidental advantage gained by the accession of James I., which not only settled the right of succession, but united together two distinct countries, which had been perpetually fighting with each other from the earliest dawn of their existence. The popular spirit, however, which had been gaining force during the Tudor period, now began to develop itself—inconveniently for the theory of the divine right of kings; and, in the reign of Charles I., the Crown and the Commons found themselves in direct opposition to each other, and battled for their rights: those of the latter being vindicated by the success of the "Great Rebellion," and finally guaranteed and made living by the Revolution of 1688. The results of the civil war were not at once

very decisive. The reign of Charles was overthrown, and the king beheaded; but the supremacy of the Commons was not abiding: and the military despotism of Cromwell being soon found to be more intolerable than the misrule of kings, royalty, in the person of Charles II., was replaced on the throne. But the disturbances were so far salutary in their consequences that they laid the foundation of England's power, infused energy and enterprise through every class of her population, promoted inquiry, and led, in the next generation, to the royal authority being curtailed for good, and defined. In the reign of Charles II., the Habeas Corpus Act, which protects the subject from illegal imprisonment, was passed; and the reign of James II. closed with the Bill of Rights, which enumerated the various laws by which the royal prerogative and popular liberties were defined and settled, the same being ratified by William and Mary on their being raised to the throne.

The corruptions of the Stuart period were atrocious; and manners were then more openly licentious and depraved than they had ever been, even during the Middle Ages. The vice of concubinage was common, and a mistress made part of the customary appendage of every great family—the principal cause of which was the low moral and intellectual standard of the age. In mathematics, physical science, and metaphysics, considerable advances had been made—Locke, Newton, and Boyle having cleared the way; but the more accessible literature of common life—that which purifies the heart and elevates manners—had barely commenced to revive. Milton, the second great poet of Britain, shed lustre over the era of the Commonwealth; but his was an isolated star, of pre-eminent purity indeed, but which only lighted the mass of impurity around it, without being able to dissipate its intenseness; nor was the atmosphere thoroughly purged till the reign of Anne—the age of Addison, Bolingbroke, and Pope—with which the Stuart period was closed. The reign of Anne was also celebrated for the great military triumphs of Marlborough over the French at Blenheim, Ramillies, and Oudenarde,

by which Louis XIV. was humiliated and his power considerably reduced; and for the chivalrous bravery of the Earl of Peterborough in Spain. But what it will be best remembered for is the formal union of England and Scotland, which was then carried out by the abolition of the separate government and separate Parliament of Scotland, and by the adoption of the consolidated title of Great Britain, from 1707.

All the civil, religious, and political institutions of England were completed during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which were followed by the rule of the house of Brunswick. Since then, in less than two hundred years, England has attained, with the greatest rapidity, her present high position in the world, and acquired an empire that environs the globe. The commencement of the Hanoverian rule was not particularly distinguished. In morals it was worse even than the worst portion of the Stuart period, and it is recorded of George I. that he brought with him from Germany a whole seraglio of faded mistresses. The peace of the country was also disturbed by the various attempts made to restore the Stuart family to the throne, both by their friends in England and Scotland, and by the sovereigns of France and Spain. No sooner were these attempts put down than the English nation found themselves, in the reign of George III., engaged in a protracted war with France—a war that called forth all the energies of Britain, and made her great almost in spite of herself. The national character had taken a long time—no less than seventeen hundred years—to mature; but it was now fully developed, and quite equal to the crisis. The result was a great accession of power and territories both in America and in the East Indies. A temporary reverse followed when, in 1775, the United States of America resisted the claims of the parent-country to tax them. These States had been created mainly by the colonisation of English inhabitants. By their first formation the parent-country was much relieved, as they served as an outlet for her political and religious discontents, and opened to her enter-

prising classes a new and boundless field of industry. Their rupture with the mother-country on a later day was the inevitable result of overgrowth. Britain, like mother-states in general, was naturally anxious to preserve her supremacy over them; but the condition of pupillage was disowned, and her rule violently overthrown. France and Spain took advantage of England's difficulty to avenge their old defeats, and humiliate the Mistress of the Seas; and, in 1779, their combined fleets, sailing up the Channel, defied England, and threatened Plymouth. All this was repaid with interest on a later day; but England was compelled to acknowledge the independence of the United States in 1783,—at which period, besides the nations openly arrayed against her, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark formed themselves into an armed neutrality that was hostile to her.

But those who had expected that the English people would be crippled, as well as humiliated, by their reverses, were disappointed. The prosperous career of England was continued, and many advantages were gained by her during the short respite from wars that followed. From the conclusion of peace with the Americans there was nothing to disturb her until the outbreak of the great war in 1793, when the French, after having deposed and murdered their king, came back to renew their old struggles with her. Hostilities were now continued for several years, and England was for some time in constant dread of French invasions, till Pitt roused the nation from their pusillanimous torpor. Then followed the development of the genius of Howe, Jervis, Collingwood, and Nelson, and the crowning triumph of Trafalgar; then the restoration of peace; and then, again, the resumption of hostilities, till the island hornets were fairly aroused and stung the French to madness at Waterloo. The gain to England from these hostilities was great, as all the French possessions in the East and West Indies were now finally taken, which made ample amends for the loss of the United States. Nor would England be a loser if these again were ever lost. Her greatness is in the spirit of the nation, which easily diverts its activity

from one sphere of action to another, and repairs loss in one quarter by gain in another.

The difficulties of England have always been Ireland's opportunity, and, during the war with France, a rebellion broke out in that island and raged with great violence. The original conquest of Ireland was accomplished in the reign of Henry II., since which time she has always preserved the character of a surly dog snapping at his master's chain. By the time of the Tudors the best portions of the island had to be reconquered, the conquest being completed towards the end of Elizabeth's reign; so that virtually James I. was the first king who ruled over the united kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. But at this time Ireland was ruled rather as a dependency, and not like Scotland, on terms of equality; and it was only natural that she should remain unreconciled to her lot. Concessions after concessions were made to her afterwards; but as the Irish were the descendants of the Celts, and by far the greater portion of them Catholics, the advances for fusion made to them by Protestants descended from the Anglo-Saxons and Normans were, for the most part, received with repugnance, and rejected. The rebellion in Ireland was suppressed after much bloodshed; and the English being determined to amalgamate her with England, an incorporating union, as with Scotland, was effected from the commencement of 1801. This arrangement was, upon the whole, carried out with great fairness; but it did not allay the discontent of the Irish. A new insurrection broke out in Ireland in 1803; and ever since she has remained as an open sore by the side of Britain, the only source of her weakness in Europe.

The reign of George III. was an illustrious one, but not simply for the triumphs which graced the British arms. All over the country the condition of all classes was ameliorated—their clothing, lodging, furniture, and diet improved. To these succeeded moral improvements, decline of intemperance, cessation of tavern indulgences, disappearance of footpads, &c. It was also the age of humanity,

when institutions of charity and benevolence were multiplied, cruel and nefarious punishments abolished, and efforts made to better the state of the poor; and when that crowning act of mercy, the abolition of the slave trade, was carried out.

The victory of Waterloo was succeeded by the longest peace on record; and peace has always proved to be England's greatest ally in securing both material improvement and improvements in mind, freedom, justice, and charity. The reigns of George IV. and William IV. were eminently progressive, the latter being particularly distinguished by the political enfranchisement of the people, and the removal of obstructive municipal and commercial monopolies. The reign of Victoria has similarly been signalized by expansion in every direction, and by an equalisation of benefits among all classes, and a multiplication of the conveniences and enjoyments of social existence. In literature, the period of the Georges produced the best of British historians—Hume, Gibbon, and Robertson; the intellectual development in other departments being sustained by a brilliant galaxy of other writers, with Johnson at their head, whose era was extended to still later days. Since then the country has become more thoroughly utilitarian even in letters, and the rage for poems and dramas has been dying out. We do not know what would be the fate of a new "Hamlet" or "Othello" at this moment; we are certain that a new "Paradise Lost" would not be endured: and, if Tennyson is tolerated, it is only because he is accepted as the last of a race that will not be perpetuated. Practical writing is now particularly valued; and novels also are much read.

The greatness achieved by England has thus been very slowly and gradually developed. It is the law of nature that all that is valuable and permanent in character should be the result, not of natural aspiration or of accidental success, but of trial and suffering, disappointment and defeat. Her constitution, which is the envy and wonder of all nations, took more than nine hundred years, from the days of the Saxons, to grow. The expulsion of the Stuarts

gave it its finishing stroke; and it has since then consisted of a hereditary monarchy, balanced on the one side by a house of peers, and on the other by a council of the people, all based on a Bill of Rights carefully defining the prerogatives and privileges of the different parties concerned. This combination as it stands could not have been formed except by a process extending over several ages. Other nations in endeavouring to arrive at the same result more quickly, have only engulfed themselves in mischief and anarchy. All Europe has since essayed the parliamentary system in imitation of England; but England alone has escaped both autocracy and anarchy, to one or other of which, if not to both, most of the other nations have fallen victims. In the English constitution no one is all-powerful—not the king, nor the lords, nor the people, nay, not even the law. Oppression when imposed by law or exercised by power has always something to check it, if it be but an unwritten custom, a remembrance, or a prejudice.

The monarchy of England is, for all executive purposes, as powerful as it need be—almost as strong, in fact, as despotism itself; but so limited in other respects that, were it thoroughly understood, it would fully satisfy the passionate ambition of those who seek in government for absolute equality. Under it the people enjoy an unbounded but unabused liberty; while the country is more prosperous than any in the world, without having had to sacrifice any rights or liberties to attain that prosperity. With all its jobberies of election, &c., the Parliament is, what it was intended to be, the great council of a great nation, where every passion and every prejudice is represented, together with the remedial opposition of great manliness, intelligence, and independence. All the real wishes and wants of the country are thus fairly brought together, and at the same time properly preponderated and reconciled. Amidst the most clamorous opposition in Parliament and from the Press, and in the face of mob-meetings and reform petitions, the Government works smoothly, backed by all the resources of liberty and liberal institutions. Everything

done is done under the fullest expansion of light and noise. Nothing escapes the universal law of publicity—a publicity very different from what is understood to be such in other countries. It is neither imposed, nor guaranteed, nor restrained, by law. It emanates from the public spirit of the nation, and is as ample as that spirit itself. Very often the liberty of the Press is violated; but that does no harm. The public reserves to itself the right of deciding in every case, and special pleading on one side or the other is perfectly innocuous. What is England's business is the private business of every man in the country, and the hands of the Government are strengthened, not weakened, by discussions whether favourable or otherwise. No amount of criticism, no amount of abuse even, can impair the vigour and resolution of a people determined to weigh all the *pros* and *cons* of a question and judge of it for themselves. It is not an ideal grievance or an ideal advantage that thus engrosses attention, but the everyday occurrences of busy life. It has always been so since England has been free; and, if it were not so, the Englishman would pull down his constitution about his own ears. His house, he knows, is not made of glass; and so he is not afraid to pelt stones at it, but rather takes a pleasure in doing so, to assure himself that what he takes so much pride in is really as substantial as he believes it to be.

After the king rank the peers, and this is so in almost all countries. But the peerage in England is a very different institution from what it is elsewhere. It draws to itself all the great notabilities of the nation—in law, in arms, in diplomacy, in finance—without any regard to their origin, at the same time that it sends back to the mass of the people all its collateral branches, which fall in with the general ranks of society without title or distinction. The law of primogeniture was introduced in the feudal times. It is unjust in principle, and therefore indefensible. But it regulates both the constitution and society of England remarkably well, by throwing over the younger sons of peers into the common herd, with whom they are trained,

and with whom they struggle energetically to recover the position from which they were thrust out. In the days of Norman supremacy the upper classes were not so easy of access from below, as the barons did not permit any encroachments on the distinctions which belonged exclusively to themselves. But the nation has since become thoroughly practical; the spinning-jenny and the steam-engine have brought down the nobility from their high elevation, or rather raised others to an equality, or near to an equality, with them. To every man who possesses talent and energy, whatever his origin, whatever his opinions, access to distinction and power is open; and, a great part of their body being thus drawn from the people, the aristocracy have no interests apart from those of the people, to whom they are faithful and by whom they are prized.

Besides the aristocracy there is a class of country gentlemen in England, who spontaneously and gratuitously perform a great portion of the public duties elsewhere performed by paid officials—acting as sheriffs, justices of the peace, grand-jurors, commissioners of roads, &c.—and who exhibit in their position and habits all the example of a real aristocracy; and, as the distinctions between these and the gentry at large are but indefinite, virtually all the classes are linked together and freely mix and commingle. There is no broad line of demarcation even to separate those in power from those who are not in power, as the boundary is being constantly crossed and recrossed. It is said of Napoleon I. that, while ruminating on his own career in St. Helena, he exclaimed: “Now we shall see what Wellington will do!” He was quite unable to understand that it was possible for an English gentleman, after having gained such triumph as was obtained at Waterloo, to stop in his onward career and resume his former position in life. It is from the bosom of rural life that in the hour of need all the great men of England are drawn; and when their work is finished they return again to their former place quietly, crowned possibly with honours and preferment—oftener not. The eminent importance of this individual

moderation to national aggrandizement was well understood in ancient Greece and Rome, but in the modern world it is understood nowhere except in America and England.

The elevation of the people in England began with her agricultural, industrial, and commercial prosperity. The story of her agricultural development is diversified. The early agriculture of England was rude, till the Romans, who took a delight in the art, improved it. From the Saxons no improvement proceeded; in peaceful arts they were inferior to the Celts they conquered. The Normans understood the subject better, but the domestic feuds of the barons prevented them from doing much, and all that was done during their time was done only by the ecclesiastics, who cultivated their ample domains with great knowledge and skill, improved the breed of cattle, and introduced better drainage wherever it was needed. The neglect of their estates by the lay lords was wicked: the rage for sheep-farming for wool to supply the manufactories of the Low Countries made matters worse; and it was not till those manufactories were ruined by religious persecution that the English farmer returned to the plough with earnestness. The progress of commerce under the Tudors and the Stuarts, and the construction of roads and highways during those periods, gave agricultural development its greatest impetus; and by the reign of Anne the whole interior of the country was full of farms. At the present moment the total cultivated area in England and Wales is set down at about thirty-four million acres, and the total uncultivated area at about six million acres—including the acreage occupied by houses and gardens in towns and villages, and by railroads, highways, rivers, and canals. The amount of land remaining to be reclaimed is necessarily very inconsiderable. All efforts at improvement are now, therefore, confined to scientific farming and the investment of capital, which attempt to make the area already under cultivation as productive as practicable. The lot of agricultural labourers in the country is, as everywhere else, the lowest,

the workpeople of cities and towns being as a rule better off. But this is true only of the class of labourers who have no lands of their own to farm. An English farmer, it is well known, is the most respectable specimen of his class in the world, and is better circumstanced not only than English workpeople in general, but even than many people of the higher classes—civil, professional, and mercantile.

The development of manufactures in the country has been still more successful. At this moment England furnishes clothing and household conveniences not only to all her own dependencies, but to a very large portion of the world; and yet for a long time past almost all foreign countries were superior to her in this respect. So obtuse was the policy of England at the outset that she actually persecuted foreigners who came over to teach her what she did not understand, and it was not till this policy was altered that any improvement was made. The manufacture of wool was the first to be introduced, and dates from the time when the Flemings came over and brought the art with them. The manufacture of silk was introduced by the French in the fourteenth century. Linen came much later on the field, as even up to 1688 the finer descriptions of it were obtained from Germany. But England made up manfully for lost time. Her foreign teachers from being first tyrannised over were afterwards encouraged, sheltered, and imitated; and, by steadily pursuing this policy, she succeeded in time in attaining the foremost place, which she retains. The chief causes of her success were the industry and probity of her children, and, in a lower degree, the invention of improved machinery by them for increasing and cheapening the products of labour. The genius of Watts, Hargreaves, and Arkwright gave an impetus to the native partiality for hard work, and soon enabled their country to outstrip all competition. In all sorts of woollen and cotton manufacture, in leather goods, in hardware manufacture, earthenware, china, and glass, England holds the first place at this moment. The poetry

of the subject is also best understood by her. The World's Fair, or Great Exhibition, was an English idea for recording the triumph of industrial enterprises, which has been adopted by all nations since; and no country need be ashamed of following England's lead in this respect at least.

The history of English commerce is a long story to tell, to which we could not do justice within such short compass as is available to us. The native riches of England gave her a mercantile character even from the days of the Phœnicians, who traded with her in tin; and to the Normans she was known as an *El Dorado* abounding in precious articles more than Normandy. But there was no signal development of her peculiar aptitude for traffic previous to the time of Elizabeth. The administrators of the Virgin reign, so pre-eminently illustrious in all respects, particularly understood the interests of buyers and sellers, and took the greatest care to disentangle the nation from all commercial treaties and alliances with other nations which were found to be embarrassing, the relief from which gave to their country her first fair start in the mart of the world. Unfortunately, in that age the monopoly system was the rage in all places, and continued to be so up to the time of the Georges, which accounts for commerce continuing to be tied down, to a considerable extent, to the latter era. The first efforts to liberate her from these shackles also emanated from England, commencing with the repeal of the Navigation laws, by which the carrying trade of the country had been confined to British-built ships owned and navigated by British subjects—an exclusiveness which was of course adopted by other countries, and led to a cessation of healthy competition. The next step taken in the same direction was the abolition of all protective duties, which rendered trade free. Both these concessions have since been widely reciprocated; but, had it not been so, the gain from them to England would still have been immense, as the best part of the world's traffic had intermediately passed into

British hands. As it is, the actual result is an unprecedented success. In riches England has never been equalled in any age by any country of not larger area and population; while, at this moment, she is absolutely the richest country in the world, almost without reference either to size or population. The revenue derived by her hereditary landowners is very considerable; but what is much greater still, is the tribute collected from all parts of the world by her princely merchants and money-dealers. As Taine remarks, "Enormous is the word that always recurs" in describing her general condition; her shipping, her traffic, her wealth are all enormous; and the greatness and happiness of her people are enormous also, notwithstanding all that her enemies may say in disparagement of them. Nor is that all. Her commercial correspondence has been extended to the utmost limits of the globe; and with her commodities and her manufactures she has been spreading her freedom and enlightenment in every direction, which has enabled her to effect the largest amount of good to the world. Are France and Germany as civilised as England? Possibly so; but they do not and cannot disseminate civilisation to the same extent that England does, because their connection with the world at large is not nearly so extensive.

The material grandeur of England is great; it is only equalled by her intellectual and moral grandeur, which are on a similar scale. The national established religion is supported by the State; but, apart from it, a large proportion of the middle and lower classes maintain beliefs and forms of worship peculiar to themselves, including Dissenters, Catholics, and Methodists—all classes of thinkers receiving toleration from the Government so long as they do not offend against public decency and the peace. This is a feature peculiar to England. It testifies to a moral independence that does not develope in other countries to an equal extent. All the establishments for the diffusion of education, also, are similarly, entirely in the hands of the people, and are maintained in complete

independence of the Government, being amenable to no authority but that of the law. The enormous self-reliance which this implies has no counterpart in Europe. The palpable benefit of the arrangement is that it produces men in a higher degree than any other system. It is unnecessary to enumerate here the worthies England has produced. Their name is legion; and they have won for her that foremost place in the rank of nations which she undeniably holds. In her, more than in any other country, have letters been fully emancipated and made accessible to all classes of the people by the publication of newspapers, magazines, and reviews, through which the influence of learning has been immeasurably extended and all topics of interest have been made generally intelligible.

The opinion of England's physical strength is generally a very unfavourable one; and all over the Continent it is largely believed that she is now a first-rate power by sufferance only. No strength is allowed to her beyond what is attributable to her position; if she has been secure from danger, it is only because she is sea-girt. No attempt is made to understand what she actually is, and whether her water-girdle alone by itself could have secured that pre-eminence to her. The advantage of being sea-girt doubtless made her a commercial power, and commerce gave her a maritime status which compelled the creation and maintenance of a navy. But if the navy had not been maintained, her sea-girt position alone would not long have secured to her the respect she commands.

This navy, like English institutions generally, has been very long in formation. So early as the days of Alfred the necessity of maintaining a fleet of boats was recognised, the swarms of pirates that infested the northern seas in the Saxon times rendering it necessary to have in hand the means of opposing them on their own element. This led to the first formation of a regular navy, which in the time of John did him great service against the barons, notwithstanding that it was simultaneously attacked by Philip of France; and in the reign of Edward III. the first naval

victory over the French was obtained off Sluys, and the first naval victory over the Spaniards off Winchelsea, which obtained for Edward the title of "King of the Sea." There was no regular sea-service, however, till the time of Henry VIII.; while Elizabeth was the first to establish a school of Marines, in which were nurtured those daring vikings—Drake, Raleigh, Frobisher, and Hawkins. The expeditions for the discovery of the North-West Passage, many of which were undertaken at this period, formed the best sailors; and the Spanish Armada came against an enemy that was well-prepared to receive it, even if the storms had not effectually interfered on his behalf. After this a long period elapsed before England was called upon to encounter an equal peril, and, as usual with her, she suffered her navy to decline till the era of the Civil War. The exertions of Cromwell to improve it were particularly great, and the fleets under Blake and Deane disputed on equal terms with the Dutch fleet under Van Trompe and De Ruyter; but, in the time of Charles II., it came to be so utterly neglected that the Dutch were enabled easily to deal a home-thrust at England, and sweep the British seas in every direction, entering even the Thames with broomstick on their mast in defiance. This rendered a reorganization of the fleet necessary during the long struggle maintained by William III. against Louis XIV.; and, by the reign of Anne, it became so efficient, that the French were compelled to surrender to it their pretensions to the dominion of the seas. Sir George Rooke having at the same time taken Gibraltar, and Sir John Leake Minorca, the Mediterranean was converted into an English lake; since which time the naval power of England has ever retained a defiant supremacy.

As we stated at the outset, those who wish to do so may here read the hand of Providence in every event that has occurred to consolidate the English power. At the Norman Conquest the winds aided the invaders, and William landed on the English coast when the Saxon king and his army and fleet were absent in the north; and so England was

conquered. Almost at every subsequent invasion, or attempt at invasion, the winds were invariably favourable to England and adverse to her enemies. The design of Charles VI. of France to repeat the exploit of the Norman was entirely defeated by the north-gale; the Spanish Armada was mainly destroyed by the storms by which it was assailed from all sides; the threatened invasion of Louis XIV. was prevented by a strong wind from the north-west; at a later period the expedition sent by Alberoni from Spain was discomfited by a tempest; and, still later, Hochie was driven from the Irish coast, which he had all but reached, by a storm. This would seem to indicate a continuous interposition of Heaven in the establishment of the naval greatness of England, by warding off from her all the heavy blows aimed at her by her enemies. The strength thus attained appears now to be well established; and it is not likely that England will again, in a hurry, be exposed to such dangers as she has passed through. Steam is said to have now bridged the Channel, by acting greatly as a safeguard against the weather, which renders it unnecessary for the invading party to await a favouring breeze. But it has given England at the same time the enormous advantage of being able to block up her enemy's ports, at a moment's notice, without reference to the weather; and so long as her navy is as efficient as it is said to be, this alone must give her a preponderance of facilities.

But is the English navy in such a state of efficiency as is usually assumed? On this point there has been some difference of opinion; but none on the yet more important points, that England's materials for maritime strength have become virtually inexhaustible, and that it is only necessary that enough of these be kept in constant readiness for sudden emergencies. The mercantile fleet of England comprises about twenty-two thousand sailing vessels and four thousand steamers, the total number of seamen employed being more than two hundred-thousand, of whom about one hundred and eighty thousand are British born.

The nearest approach to these figures, at a very considerable distance, are those furnished by the statistics of the United States; but the countries of Europe are nowhere for purposes of comparison. The bone and sinews of a navy are necessarily in the number of seamen a country can bring forward in her need, and in the celerity with which she can provide fit vessels and arms for them. As regards vessels, it is necessary only to observe that the passenger-ships of England on any one "line" will bear a comparison, in numbers at least, with the national squadron of any other country; and that any number of additional ships of any strength can be constructed at the private dock-yards in England at the shortest warning. Similarly, in the manufacture of war materials, England works cheaper and better than all the other powers; and her private firms can turn out on a pressure as much of them as all the Government manufactories in the other countries taken together. Most of those other countries come to England for their ironclads and their guns; and those that do not, employ English engineers to work for them or instruct their workmen. With ships and materials of war, therefore, England can be sooner and better supplied than any other country.

As to the actual state of the British navy, it may be admitted that even now it has not attained a theoretical standard of perfection, though for all practical purposes it seems to be quite equal to any emergency. The only other naval powers of any pretensions are America, Russia, and France. The Americans themselves have of course loudly maintained that in shipbuilding, as in everything else, they have left the Britishers a long way behind; while the truth is, that not more than one-fifth of their so-called navy is seaworthy, the remaining four-fifths being only fit to be sold as old iron. Russia has been building some large ships; but it is generally understood that these vessels have not answered expectations at all, and though they may prove well-enough for coast defence, are not fit for other work. The French vessels, if not absolutely rotten, are all obsolete, and would not long stand the booming of

English guns. Germany and Italy have each the nucleus of a good navy—namely, a few good ships—but nothing that can cause any alarm to England. In the absence, therefore, of greater efficiency on the part of her probable enemies, the perfection England has attained may well be accepted as conclusive, since she has a large number of ships, most of which are in superb condition.

The army of England is of course not very strong, and never was so. She has kept up an efficient navy only to protect her commerce, which is scattered all over the globe: but she does not seek for military renown, and her policy has always been deliberately and systematically to keep down her army, that she might devote all her energies to the development of the arts of peace. The navy, we have seen, began to be organized from the time of Alfred, the Saxon. The introduction of a standing army dates from a much later era. The Normans, and William the Conqueror pre-eminently, built castles and fortresses; but they had no standing army. They relied for the supply of troops on the aid of the feudal barons and other tenants of the Crown who held their fiefs on condition of military service; and also on bands of mercenary warriors. The first regularly-formed arm of the military service was the archer-corps, which was introduced by the Normans for utilizing the yeomen of England by training them to this service; and, in the old wars, this corps was always the most formidable on the field. The formation of a regular staff of officers for the army dates from the reign of Elizabeth, when it was organized in connection with the wars of the Dutch Protestants and the Huguenots, and those of the Netherlands with France. The great Civil War called into active existence a deal of energy and excellence in all soldierly qualities; but these were not exercised against any foreign enemies, but only against each other at home. A fair army was formed by the reign of Anne, when the genius of Marlborough gave a prestige to the English arms, and shattered the power of the greatest European monarch of the day; and the success thus secured was

transmitted to the era of the Georges, and culminated in the triumph gained at Waterloo. But it cannot be said that at any time of her history England has taken much pains to organize a grand-army equal to, or approaching to an equality with, any of the great armies maintained on the Continent.

This has given rise to the cant that the English are not a military nation. All that is true is that the English have never betrayed an appetite for glory and war. But they have at all times evinced self-sacrifice and enthusiasm in the military service of their country with an amount of physical courage that has never been surpassed. The victories of the English army are well-known, and have been referred to. The worst defeats of England were those sustained under the Duke of Cumberland at Fontenoy and Laupfelt, and in his weak defence of Hanover against the French, which led to the ignominious capitulation of Clostersevern. With reference to the first two, the French commander, Marshal Saxe, candidly admitted that the British infantry did all that could have been done under the circumstances, and what no other troops in the world would have imitated; and greater praise from an enemy was never received. It is clear, therefore, that England has, in this respect also, the right materials to work with. The regular English army is, it is true, very inconsiderable, as compared with the armies kept up by the Continental nations; and it is doubtful if England could materially augment its strength without interfering with her domestic and mercantile economy. But every Englishman knows how to fight, and the emigration statistics of Great Britain show to what extent her rank and file can be replenished in the hour of need by the payment of a liberal bounty. England has therefore no need to swell up her regular army with useless soldiers. The fears of sudden annihilation by a *coup de main* are childish and unworthy of being entertained. No great nation ever has been, or could be, suddenly wiped out. It is true that nations now arm themselves *en masse* for war, and seek once for all utterly

to crush the adversary they have to deal with ; but, in the case of Britain at least, no invader could ever come over *en masse* to the scratch, while it will always be in the power of the people invaded to rise *en masse* in their own defence.

The general tenor of success on their side throughout the whole course of their national existence has made the English people believe themselves to be invincible ; and the pride is not yet extinct which makes them assume that, in respect to physical strength and courage, one Englishman is equal to two men of any other country in the world. On the other hand, the peaceful occupation of the nation generally, and their aversion to assume a belligerent attitude, are marked ; and all the Continental powers believe that England, in her quiescent state, already shows symptoms of decay. It is scarcely necessary to combat this belief. As a country devoted to peaceful occupations, England is naturally averse to take offence ; and her first efforts to resent it when given are, as a rule, feeble, ill-directed, and abortive. But, if unprepared at the outset, she soon makes up her deficiencies by her fortitude and perseverance ; and in all wars she has hitherto always been successful at the end. The conclusion of the Crimean war, in which England figured so unfavourably, found Russia, not humiliated only, but also perfectly exhausted. In France the result was nearly as embarrassing, provision rising in price and capital being withdrawn from internal industry. But England did not suffer from the consequences to any perceptible extent. Her means and appliances were, on the contrary, augmented ; and she found herself stronger at the end of the war than she was at the beginning of it. This is not a proof of decline. The preponderating evidence is all on the other side. It is only under the house of Hanover that England has enjoyed the plenitude of her greatness. After a long trial of courage and patience was this greatness attained. It is yet too early to say that the hour of triumph has passed by. The constitutional liberty of the country and her indomitable energy still remain ; and so long as they do remain, there

can be no real decline in her power. Other countries, it may be, are gradually coming up to an equality with her; but there is no sign to indicate that her motion has become retrograde, or even that she has come to a halt. She has herself made the greatest noise of her disasters and shortcomings. She has not only detected her own deficiencies, but has made almost a parade of them on all occasions. No other country in the world can afford to act so. But is that a sign of decline, or of the greatest self-correcting vigour? In other countries victories are exaggerated, and defeats concealed or palliated. It is in England only that the most indubitable success is severely and even maliciously criticised.

There is no doubt, however, that old states do become effeminate by efflux of time, and first become stationary, and then begin to decline; while younger states, prompted by greater resources, wants, or energies, gradually rise to an equality with them, and eventually outstrip them in the race. Russia is the youngest of the European communities, and, with her increasing population and limitless territory, is not unlikely to outstrip the older states in time. The United States of America, from similar or still greater advantages, may in like manner come to arrogate for themselves a position of pre-eminence. This it is not in the power of England, or of any other country, to prevent. But the relative position of the parties has not yet been so changed as to justify any fears of England being thrown backwards soon. The only circumstance against her is that her greatness is disproportioned to her size and population; but this does not necessarily imply that the time for rectifying the disproportion is at hand. Pitting the British Empire as an aggregate against any other power, the preponderance still remains with her, and will do so for a long time to come; though, in the course of centuries, it may be her lot to come down to a position nearer equality with a few of her rivals.

The general hatred of England all over Europe and America is well known; and there is no doubt that this

has arisen mainly from the arrogance of the English character and the vituperations of the English press. It is also attributable to a feeling of envy common to all nations who see in England an advance too great for them to equal, and wish heartily that she may come down that they might thereby be enabled to overtake her. The crowing against her comes from every quarter. It is now the Gallic hen that sputters through the mouths of her strutting colonels, and boasts of being able to uproot the British Islands from their foundations in the sea; or it is the staid Prussian general or semi-military politician, who calculates on paper the feasibility of conquering England at this time of the day by invading it again in Norman fashion; or it is the astute Russian, who complacently praises his own moderation that prevents him from overrunning the diamond-paved shores of India; or it is the tall-talking Yankee, who boasts of his ability to whip creation, Canada, and England out of existence. But which of these powers alone is at this moment equal to England? In England it is the genius of the nation that rules, fights, and acts on every emergency; and the genius of a great nation pitted against the genius of one mind, however great—be it Napoleon's or Bismarck's—cannot but be successful in the end. No sudden blow, however great, could possibly paralyze the energies of a stubborn people like the English; no French, Prussian, or Russian victory could humiliate England except for the passing hour. A war with the United States would perhaps be somewhat different; but, as yet, the old mother is more than a match for the virago that disowns her birth. One thing is certain—that the ruin of England when it does come, will be a calamity to the world, which will not be remedied by the greatness either of Russia or America, or of any other country yet known to us.

CHAPTER III.

THE DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

COLONISATION is an inseparable adjunct to every great state, but more especially to an insular kingdom of small size like the British Isles, the energies of which are circumscribed within a limited sphere. Every prosperous country has a tendency to become redundantly rich and redundantly peopled, and for these exuberances of wealth and population, new outlets must be found, new lands discovered and reclaimed, and the foundations laid for new communities. The prosperous manufacturer requires a wider sphere for the disposal of his wares than the home-market affords; the prosperous merchant more extensive marts for profitable traffic; the wealthy capitalist an opener range for the investment of his superfluous wealth. Colonisation for these ends is the natural remedy of inevitable overgrowth; and the nation that has resort to it, instead of being weakened or impoverished, is only rendered stronger and richer by such depletion.

This has been the case pre-eminently with England. She has extended herself in every direction as widely as it was possible to do so, from the icy regions of the arctic to those of the antarctic circle; from the East Indies on one side, to the West Indies on the other; over every soil and in every clime, implanting or civilising, and in either case widely extending her language, laws, and liberties, and contributing to the well-being of the human race. Wondrous is the empire that has thus been established, and just the proud boast that on that empire the sun never sets; and the wealth which her dependencies bring her is so exuberant and diversified, that it has been correctly observed that there is absolutely no produce of Nature that is not grown on British soil.

The rage for colonisation and distant possessions sprang into existence with the commencement of the seventeenth century, previous to which England was but a small insular kingdom that scarcely gave promise of the expansion it was destined to receive. At this period almost half the globe was divided by treaty, as well as by an order of the Vatican, between the two great empires of Spain and Portugal, when a strong contest for power arose, other nations having intermediately become anxious to share in their aggrandizement. Fortunately for England the age was that of the wise Elizabeth, who was encompassed by a bevy of administrators whose ability has perhaps never been equalled. They foresaw the coming events of the age, and directed all their energies to turn them into shape, founding the first steps of that greatness and maritime dominion which were subsequently attained. The progress of England was slow and gradual, but always well-sustained, and everything gave way before it—the opposition alike of Spain, Portugal, Holland, and France.

The first colonies of Great Britain were the United States of America, to which we shall separately refer. Since those States became independent, the chief colonies of Britain have comprised Canada, Australasia, the Cape of Good Hope, and the West Indies; while India, though not a colony, shines out from the centre of southern Asia as the brightest jewel of the British crown. As her hold of India gives Great Britain the greatest prominence in the scale of nations, as it has contributed most of all to augment both her wealth and her power, and as it has, moreover, opened all eastern Asia to European commerce and civilisation, we shall first notice this great dependency of the empire, before passing on to the colonies proper we have named.

India.

The history of the British empire in India has no parallel in the records of time, but much in regard to it does not require to be said in this place. The first

appearance of the English on Indian soil was only as suppliants for the establishment of mercantile residencies, the suppliants being well-armed, though at that time not dreaming of conquest or dominion. They were armed, not against the native races among whom they appeared, but against their European rivals, the Dutch and the Portuguese, with whom they were constantly at war. From these contests originated that military reputation which the English were soon enabled to establish in the East, and which led to their being courted, not only by the Great Mogul of India, but also by the Sháh of Persia. Both those sovereigns utilized their services for the destruction of pirates, and, at the price of the aid thus given, many of the commercial advantages sought for by the adventurers were obtained, with a local habitation in India which served as the nucleus from which they expanded. The English East India Company was formed in 1600, and its first trading fleet went out in the following year to commence operations on some of the islands to the south-west of the peninsula. The first factories on the mainland were established in Surát, Áhmedábád, and Cambay, in 1612; and in the next ten years some factories were also opened on the Coromandel coast. The construction of a fortified factory at Madrásปัตံ was permitted in 1640, about which time permission was also obtained to set up a factory at Hooghly. Bombay was obtained in 1668 from the Portuguese, as part of the dowry brought in by the Infanta of Portugal on her marriage with Charles II. After this, the disruption of the Mogul empire led to the factories being armed; and the native powers which arose into existence from the ruins of the empire, appreciating the courage of the foreign merchants, were glad to enlist their assistance in their contests with each other—an assistance always rendered with alacrity, as serving to secure that commercial position which had already been established.

For the first hundred years the great rivals of the English in the East were the Dutch and the Portuguese.

The French came in later, but soon succeeded, like the English, in securing a surer footing on the soil. The times were troublesome and critical, and things had come to that pass that any clever adventurer who could collect a force of irregular troops, or even a gang of robbers (and there was not much real difference between the two), could hope to found a sovereignty, as was actually done by Sivájee and Hyder Álly, and a host of others of lesser name. The French were the first to discover that these native armies were not able to stand against European troops, but that they could be disciplined on the European model and their services then utilized. They also discovered the art of setting the native powers against each other to weaken them; and, with these discoveries, they had every prospect of founding a permanent empire on the ruins of the Mogul throne. Their knowledge, however, did not long benefit them; it more fully benefited the English, who received it from them at second hand, and then adroitly turned it against them. The two powers established side by side in the country, and almost on an equal footing, soon found the expulsion of one of them to be an unavoidable alternative to both, and this brought them soon at loggerheads with each other, when they began to raise armies which were paid for by the princes whom they affected to support, while they fought on their own behalf. Another advantage simultaneously gained by both parties was that, on pecuniary payments failing, territorial assignments were obtained from the princes, which brought with them the exercise of civil as well as military power. The first English possessions on the Coromandel and Malabár coasts were, almost all of them, acquired in this manner. In Bengal, the Dewánný was acquired from the hands of the expiring Mogul, when the assumption of such power had become necessary to the Company for self-preservation. The French power collapsed at about the same time, from 1760, after the battle of Wándewásh, the last turning point in a prolonged struggle which had been carried on with various

vicissitudes for a long series of years. This led to the annexation of extensive territories to the British settlement of Madrás, and on these foundations was raised the stupendous power now owned by the British in India.

We have not dwelt on the question of right or wrong as connected with the acquisition of this authority by the British; it would be simply useless to discuss such a question now. All the proceedings of those days cannot be vindicated, and no one understands that better than the nation by whom Warren Hastings was impeached and tried. But the existence of the English in India depended on the steps that were taken, and they have ever since endeavoured to make all the amends in their power for such injustice as was done to the country at the outset. The struggle with France was fierce and obstinate, and on both sides intrigue had as much play as force; and these intrigues were directed not only against the principals opposed, but also against their allies. In Bengal, the persecution of the Mahomedan rulers gave birth to reprisals on the part of the English, which were not perhaps as just as they were successful; but the enforcement of authority on a foreign soil always implies some injustice of that sort, and it must be admitted that the English name has not been very free from stain in that respect.

The sovereignty of the East India Company in India commenced from 1765, all the territory from Calcuttá to Alláhábád and Lucknow having been intermediately occupied. The Nawáb of Bengal had in fact been so much reduced, that he was glad to purchase peace on any terms, and willingly paid all the charges of the war which made him a puppet in his own dominions; and the Court of Delhi was equally eager to confirm the conquerors in the possessions they had acquired. The political importance thus gained was so great that the Imperial Government now came forward to claim a share of it, and in 1772 it was determined in Parliament that all civil and military correspondence regarding India should be submitted to the king's ministers; that a supreme court of judicature should

be sent out to India by the Crown; and that the country should be divided into three presidencies, and made subject to a Governor-General and Council, the former of whom was to be approved by the king. The administrative arrangements have since then been considerably modified and improved; and from the Sepoy War of 1857-58, the direct management of the country has been assumed by the Crown, and devolves on a special Secretary of State.

The first native attempt to overturn the British power was that made by Hyder and Tippoo, sovereigns of Mysore, at the instigation of the French. Then followed the attempts made by the Mahrattás and their great chiefs named Scindia and Holkár. These were succeeded by the aggressions of the Pindáris, a set of freebooters actively abetted by the Mahrattá princes. On the outskirts of the country the English had also to fight the Nepálese and the Burmese. All these may be received as indications that the native races did not relish the dominion of Great Britain, and did not accept it without demur, and that the imposition of it on them, notwithstanding such sanguinary protests, was only an unjustifiable assertion of the doctrine of Might. This doubtless was so; but, having obtained the sovereignty of the country, England was no longer in a position to recede.

But though the rule of England in India was thus based on force, which is at all times more or less inexcusable, it has, nevertheless, practically been very kind, just, and beneficent. Up to this day its character is that of pure despotism, but civil, not military, and regulated by great wisdom and leniency. History gives no example of a conquest so completely turned to the good of the vanquished. What was the country before, under the domination of the Afgháns, Moguls, and Mahrattás, but a theatre of perpetual anarchy and confusion? What is it now? A mutiny or rebellion has passed over it. Did any sane man in it believe that any native king would have governed it as well as it was being governed by strangers? Under them the entire country is at peace, from one extremity of it to

the other. With a few isolated spots on the frontier excepted, this has been the case for a long series of years. When was this the case before? The Suttee, infanticide, and human sacrifices have ceased. Irregular exactions have been superseded by a regular taxation. All the races in the land are being initiated in civilisation. Justice is afforded to rich and poor alike, where injustice and oppression were triumphant for ages. Schools have been set up in every nook and corner; while three universities, one in each Presidency, superintend the education of the higher classes.

It is said that the people have not yet got reconciled to English rule; but this is only true after great qualifications. The government of a foreign people, however liked, will only be borne so long as it is enforced, or so long as the people believe that it will or can be enforced. The prestige of the English name after the suppression of all internal opposition, was well established, and there was a contented submission everywhere from that time. This was disturbed by the Afghán war. Under the influence of an attack of Russophobia, Afghánistán was invaded with the avowed object of expelling from it the reigning sovereign and setting up in his place a British puppet; and to this end Ghazni was taken and occupied. The indignant Afgháns repelled the outrage both by violence and deceit; upon which a capitulation to evacuate the country was signed. The evacuation was met by faithless onslaughts, the whole of the retreating army was assassinated, all the women were taken prisoners—many of whom were never rescued. An avenging army went to repair a mischief that did not admit of being repaired. Kabool was reoccupied, and a great part of the country was overrun and laid waste; but the country was found untenable, and the avenging army had to be withdrawn. The great mistake of accepting a position in which the British power appeared to be weaker than that to which it was opposed, was not rectified; the prestige of the English name was lost. It has not yet been fully re-established.

The first result of the Afghán war was the contumacy of the Ámeers of Scinde, a kind of feudal lords who occupied the lower delta of the Indus. They were easily conquered and their country taken—an arrangement which Sir Charles Napier, who recommended and gave effect to it, could only defend "as a very advantageous, useful, and humane piece of rascality." The next affair was more complicated—namely, the quarrel with the Sikhs. They attacked British territory, and were repelled and their power overthrown,—but after such hard fighting as had not been witnessed in India since the days of Lake and Wellesley. We cannot help stating it, but it is a fact, that this semi-barbarous people fought more heroically for their homesteads than did the French against the Germans in the last war between them.

These victories went a great way in reimpressing on the native mind the invincibility of the British arms. But, as we have said already, that end has not yet been fully attained. The annexation of Oude on the mere pretext of misgovernment was sufficient to lead to the Sepoy War, the Sepoy having imbibed the notion that, if he only resisted as the Afgháns did, the English would disappear. The suppression of the revolt has quieted men's minds for the time, but it takes a much longer time to re-establish a good name than to lose it, and it cannot yet be said that the English are so much feared in India now as they used to be; and this is the real source of their weakness in the land.

As for invasion from without, it is only interested parties that revive the old fears about them from time to time, in the hope of being able to force on their Government the adoption of such measures as would enhance the value of their services at the cost of the State. The wish of the Russians to invade India is a pure myth; nor could they take it if they wished it. All that they could do, if they were really so foolish as to attempt it, would be to bring down a weary and exhausted army to the banks of the Indus, to find there their graves. Vambéry significantly

points out that Russia would not have to bring down forces from St. Petersburg or Moscow, but only from the Siberian forts and from her stand-points in Central Asia. But what is the strength of her garrisons there? In Central Asia she has never yet been able to muster in greater strength than is represented by twenty thousand fighting men. Will an army of that strength, or twice that strength, or three times that strength, conquer India? The military force of Britain in India consists, in round numbers, of sixty-five thousand European troops and one hundred and twenty-five thousand native troops, besides which there are above three hundred-thousand native troops maintained by the feudatory chiefs, more than half of which would be available to the British Government in time of need. All these are well-disciplined forces, not likely to be vanquished before they are considerably outnumbered.

Of course Russia can outnumber these forces by bringing down the Afgháns with her. The Afghán is vengeful, and still harps on the Kabool massacres, which have not yet been avenged. "Come, let us go and plunder India together," would be an invitation which the wild mountaineers would never refuse. But, thus brought down, how are they to be forced back again? They have more claims on India than Russia has, having in times past given conquerors and rulers to the land. Long before India was well occupied, the allies would be quarrelling on the merest trifle, and then it would be the Russians, not the Afgháns, that would have to retire.

Perhaps greater danger to India may be apprehended from a Russo-American alliance, and the termagant young lady across the Atlantic would not be very unwilling, perhaps, to lend herself to any enterprise that would embarrass her thriving mother. But Russia, if not infatuated, will think twice before embarking on such an enterprise, as the struggle would necessarily be long and obstinate, and a protracted war with England is what she will be least able to maintain. Even France was unable to carry on such a war with England when they contested

with each other for supremacy in India; and the extent to which Russia broke down after the Crimean War would seem to indicate that it would be hopeless for her under similar circumstances to prevent her own combustion. The Czar, says Vambéry, is constructing railways to facilitate the passage of pilgrims to holy places and of soldiers to India. Be it so. If England can properly utilize the strength she has in India itself, she will be quite able to repel all the Cossacks that the railways of the Czar could bring against her. Armed with Snider rifles, the Punjábies and Rájpoos—leaving aside the Mahomedans, who need not be trusted—will be more than a match for such soldiers as the Cossacks.

But are not Vambéry and the other Russophobists mistaking Russia's object altogether? A regular army can now, says Vambéry, be transported in twenty days from the shores of the Caspian to Herát. But Herát is not the key to India, as was long erroneously supposed. Across Afghánistán is a wild raid to ride. People who talk of the march from Herát to India appear to forget how the army of Napoleon I. fared on its invasion of Russia; and yet that was an invincible army led on by the greatest warrior of the age, with generals subordinate to him almost as able as their chief. An army that attempted to cross over Afghánistán to come to India would fare much worse. Herát, therefore, does not open India to the invader in the least. It only opens Russia's path to Persia. If it be that Russia is preparing for the thorough and simultaneous subversion of the Mahomedan power in Turkey and Persia, England has no call to oppose her to thwart that consummation. She has got a very turbulent Mahomedan population in India to control, which will be less so when the Turks and the Persians cease to be independent; and for the preservation of the balance of power in Europe, England has no particular need to interfere, since no one has more heavily freighted that balance than herself.

We do not deny that it is in the power of Russia to

provoke a collision with the English if, knowing her risks, she chooses to do so ; and this may convulse India and throw back her civilisation for half a century : but it can do nothing more. The people of India as a rule are contented, if not happy, under their present rulers. The Hindu races have no particular reason to hate them, and freely admit that their conquerors are zealously working for their civilisation. Some Hindus, it is true, joined the Sepoy revolt, but only as dupes ; and they well remember the lesson that was taught them on that occasion, and are not likely to rise again. The approach of the Russians may make the Mahomedans restive : but it is not probable that even they would prefer the Russians as masters in place of the English ; and though they may wish to fight for their own hand, in that they know they have not the slightest chance of success. Russia would not back them to restore Mahomedanism to India, and the Mahomedans would not submit to the Russians with any better grace than they submit to the English. Were it possible, then, to shake the firm seat of England in India even for a time, it would only be to wear out the Russian and Moslem powers against each other.

The territories held by England in India comprise an area at least eight times as large as that of Great Britain and Ireland, with a population four times as numerous, the latest returns giving the population of the British territory in India alone at one hundred and ninety-five millions. The natives of the country suffice for the cultivation of the soil and the development of its resources, while the service of the Government and the occupations of trade find employment for the large number of Europeans now supported by it. The revenue of India amounts to about fifty millions sterling ; and if the expenditure comes up to a nearly equal sum, or between forty-eight and forty-nine millions, that includes the handsome remuneration paid to Europeans for service and on other accounts, by which Great Britain is largely and directly benefited. The imports of merchandise to India are valued at about forty-five millions, and the

exports from it at about fifty-eight millions. A dependency so rich was never possessed by any country before: well-governed and consolidated, it would make a first-class power of itself; and fully does it account for the envy with which the success of the English in India is regarded by other nations. But what other nation would have proved equal to the trust, and have done half as much good to the country held under subjection in return for the advantages reaped from it? The people of India had a civilisation of their own when they were subdued, and that accounts for Christianity not having been able to supersede Bráhmánism or Mahomedanism; but, short of that, the teachings of the English have been fully appreciated, and are emulated and followed, and even the ethics of the English code are now in the ascendant in a country which had long retained a name for perjury and dishonesty. And through India, all this civilisation has, to the glory of England, been refracted to China, Japan, Siam, and Persia.

Canada.

Of colonisation proper the noblest result obtained by England was the formation of the United States of America, which have since become independent. Notwithstanding their defection, however, a very fair portion of the North American continent is still an integral part of the British empire, adding to it an area of three and a half million square miles, and a population which has already risen to above four millions. The Canadian Dominion, as this territory is now called, comprises Canada (East and West), New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Breton, with the whole of the Hudson-Bay territory, which is almost uninhabited. The first of these, Canada, was so named by the Spaniards (*Capo di Nada*, or the Cape of Nothing) when they went to it in search of gold and were disappointed. The first to settle in it were the French, who named it *Nouvelle* or *New France*. A party of convicts colonised it so early as 1598;

but no regular settlement was formed till 1608, or about the time when the Pilgrim Fathers went out from Britain to colonise New England. The wars between the English and the French were at this time very frequent, and the French colonies in America came thus to be several times taken and given back. Canada was finally wrested from France by General Wolfe, in 1759, and formally ceded by the treaty of 1762. At this time all its wealth consisted of the skins of the bear, the beaver, the buffalo, the fox, the marten, the minx, and the wolf. The wealth and resources of Canada now are quite equal to what the wealth and resources of the United States were at the commencement of their career of independence. Next to England and the United States she has the largest mercantile marine in the world.

New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were both portions of New France or Acadia, and were colonised in 1604. After having been lost and restored on several occasions, they were finally transferred to Great Britain in 1713, though they continued to be a source of contest till 1762, or the time when Canada was formally ceded. Prince Edward Island had been little used by the French, and was not settled till after the conquest of Acadia by Great Britain, when many of the French colonists crossed over the narrow strait to occupy it. It fell into the hands of the English in 1758, when Cape Breton also was taken.

The Hudson-Bay territory was named after Hudson, who proceeded in that direction in 1610, on an expedition in search of a north-west passage to India. In 1670, a company, called the Hudson-Bay Company, was formed for the appropriation of this *terra incognita* and the development of commerce in it. These owners held under the words of their charter all the lands and territories lying within the entrance of Hudson Strait not already owned by Great Britain or actually possessed by any other State—that is, all the tract from Labrador and the Atlantic Ocean to British Columbia and the Pacific, the total area of which was equal to about one-half of Russia, and to thrice the

size of India. Of course the Company could make no use of such vast possessions, though they held them for nearly two centuries. All their operations were confined to the carrying on a trade in furs with the Indian tribes residing in the country, which gave them very large profits—so much as fifty per cent.—to secure which, and prevent the country being colonised, the worst reports about it were sedulously propagated. It is only nine years since this vast territory was transferred to the Dominion of Canada. Its present condition is very similar to that of Asiatic Russia, which it resembles also in respect to climate and soil, and in the possession of vast forests and immense rivers. In winter the southern part of the territory is usually covered with one foot, and the northern with four feet, of snow—so much as twenty feet of snow being seen at times in some places. But the Indians nevertheless affirm that, naked as they are, they suffer more from heat than cold. All these tracts at present are nearly waste; but the completion of the railways in hand will open them out largely for occupation and culture.

The surrender of Canada to England in 1759 was burdened with about sixty thousand French inhabitants and above eight thousand converted Indians, who became subjects of Great Britain, and took the usual oath of allegiance. But the troubles in store for them were heavy. Montcalm, on being defeated by Wolfe, predicted that the conquest of Canada by England would endanger her retention of the New England colonies, which already betrayed much impatience of restraint, that had hitherto been controlled only by their fears of the French. Within thirteen years after the surrender of Canada this prediction was fulfilled. The Canadians, among whom a civil government had then quite recently been established, were asked by the revolted States to join them in their rebellion, or at any rate to remain neutral during the war; but this they refused. This led to an attack of Canada, which was indignantly repelled. The country suffered much by the war; but its gain was greater from the loyalty displayed by it. Hitherto the

general impression had been that Canada was in a state of dormant insurrection, and people from Great Britain were averse to proceed to it. It was now found that the case was otherwise, and immigration in large numbers was commenced, which materially contributed to strengthen it. The Government aided these immigrants by the grant of free passage, the free gift of rations and tools on arrival, and the gift of one hundred acres of land to each individual; by which means the number of English colonists was so considerably augmented, that, by 1783, it was found to be fully equal to the number of French colonists, or those who claimed descent from the French. Between these different races, however, no great friendship was formed. The success of the English adventurers in all the enterprises they undertook filled the French with envy and hatred; while the English, on their part, looked down on them with their usual arrogance and scorn.

After the declaration of American independence, Canada was, in 1791, divided into two distinct provinces called Upper or West Canada, and Lower or East Canada, the former being inhabited by the English colonists, and the latter by the French. A representative Assembly was at the same time given to each, a boon which the French Canadians did not at that time appreciate; and, in 1807, there was an open rupture between the House of Assembly of Lower Canada and its Legislative Council, which led to the Assembly being dissolved. The position of the colony was somewhat bettered in 1811; but dissatisfaction still continued, and the Americans sought to profit by it during their second war with Great Britain, in 1812. A fresh invasion of Canada was attempted, or rather a series of invasions, which fared no better than the first. The Canadians only wanted justice from England, but had neither sympathy for the American character nor regard for American institutions. They still liked their dependence on England well enough, or, at all events, were not willing to be absorbed into the United States; and not only were the invasions of America repelled, but the scene of war was

transferred to the enemy's country, Washington being attacked and captured, after which peace was willingly concluded by the United States.

The loyalty of the Canadians was for a long time ill-requited, and the French Canadians especially suffered most from domestic troubles. In both Upper and Lower Canada violent antagonism was established between the official and non-official classes, by the power exercised by the Legislative Councils over the Houses of Assembly. Lower Canada complained, but submitted to this unjust arrogation of authority; Upper Canada threatened an insurrection and amalgamation with the United States. The rebellion in the latter lasted for three days, and induced the mother-country to send out a Governor-General over all the provinces of British North America for the adjustment of differences. A second revolt was attempted in the neighbourhood of Montreal, but did not ripen.

The suggestions made by the Earl of Durham, the Governor-General referred to, for improving the condition of Canada, were adopted in 1839. The two provinces of it were now reunited, and made subject to one legislative and administrative system; and the class interests of the colony, which had formed the chief point of discord, were broken up by the free admission of the French Canadians into the Legislative Council. The subsequent progress of the country has been very rapid. In 1867, all the British colonies in North America were confederated under the designation of the Canadian Dominion, and since then the tide of immigration has become so strong that the population of Canada is now increasing more rapidly even than that of the United States. The field, of which no adequate use has yet been made, is extensive, and the prize held out to the starving population in England is so enticing that the future of Canada cannot but be very hopeful. Of vast tracts between Labrador and Columbia, the only inhabitants now are the wild Indians, who in no degree occupy them fully, even when they are not continually wandering from place to place. These are more attached to the English

than they ever were to the French, or are to the Americans elsewhere on the continent; but they are generally so barbarous, and so resolutely prefer to die than accept European civilisation, that, eventually, they will most probably have to disappear. The preservation of the savage races, and their amalgamation with their conquerors, may possibly have been, as has been frequently alleged, an object sought for by statesmen of every party; but the English settlers do not appear ever to have been very partial to the idea, and in every place the savages have vanished, or are vanishing, from the face of the earth. Direct hostility to them, however, cannot be charged against the English—at least at the present day; and if they are retreating before them, it is of their own accord. So far as Canada is concerned, their final disappearance is a distant contingency to consider. As yet there is ample room for all comers, without infringing on the rights of the native inhabitants: vast tracts on every side await to be tilled, and vast resources and mines of wealth remain to be utilized. The commercial value of the country, as developed at present, already shows the exports to Britain to be worth about nine and a half millions sterling yearly, and the imports thence about eight and a half millions. The aggregate value of Canadian commerce, including all imports and exports, is about fifty-four millions a year.

The prevalent disease of the hour in respect to India is Russophobia. A similar disease prevails in respect to Canada, which we may call Americophobia. The relations of Canada with the United States have never been very friendly. During the civil war between the North and the South, Canada sympathized with the cause of the secession, and a great number of her citizens aided the Confederates. The irritation in the United States created thereby still continues, though outwardly good terms have continued to be kept by both parties. A treaty is now under discussion for securing a reciprocal concession of fishing rights, by which Canada will virtually surrender a most lucrative monopoly to purchase a free trade with the States, which may or may

not be advantageous enough to outweigh her certain loss. But the good feeling of the Americans can never be purchased; no amount of concession or bribery will ever secure it. In season and out of season they are always boasting that they have only to stretch forth their hands to take possession of Canada, although they were twice beaten back from it; and the English nation generally have made up their minds to believe in the boast. It was at one time seriously contemplated to make over Canada to the French in exchange for their possessions in India; but to this the French did not agree, because Pondicherry yields a large revenue, which Canada does not. It is fortunate that the negotiations came thus to be broken off. The shame of England would have been indelible if a colony had been abandoned where the English name promises to be perpetuated in the new world, as it will be in the old world in Australasia. In a short time the Canadians will be fully able to take care of themselves; and it is only to be hoped that till then England will stand by them for all the tall talk of the United States. Nations, like individuals, are best kept up to the mark by a spirit of rivalry. This spirit has already arisen between the Canadians and the Yankees. It may improve both. The constitution of Canada is very nearly the same as that of England, and better than that of America. Will the Americans borrow from the Canadians that which they will not accept from England?

Australasia.

Australia is the largest island in the world, so large that it has been correctly called an island-continent. It is nearly three thousand miles from east to west, and about two thousand miles from north to south, its total area being not less than three-fourths of Europe. The whole of this superficial extent, however, is not available for colonisation, a great portion of the interior being hopelessly barren and impassable, forming a hollow basin of sand in dry weather, and a shallow inland sea during the rains. Immediately

to the south of Australia is the island of Van Diemen's Land, or Tasmania, which is about the size of Ireland; and to the east of Van Diemen's Land is New Zealand, which, with the entire group of islands belonging to it, is nearly equal in area to Great Britain. All these have been colonised by Great Britain, and form, as it were, one family-group, though some of the settlements are very much in advance of the rest.

Australia was first discovered by the Spaniards in 1606, but was explored much later, between 1616 and 1627, by the Dutch, who gave it the name of New Holland. In 1770, Captain Cook touched upon the eastern coast of the island, at the bay which, from the number of curious wild flowers in it, he called Botany Bay. Sixteen years later, the independence of America having closed the great outlet by which the mother-country had till then thrown out her criminal population, the question of colonising Botany Bay was considered, and the first batch of convicts was sent out in 1787, and landed at Sydney in the following year. Thus was New South Wales first colonised as a convict-settlement only; and this character was retained by it till 1821.

Van Diemen's Land was first discovered by the Dutch in 1642, but was not then known to be an island, being taken for a projection of New Holland. It came to be recognised as an island in 1798, six years after which it was taken possession of in the name of the British Crown, when the colonies of Hobart Town and George Town were founded, the settlers consisting entirely, as in the case of New South Wales, of convicts and the soldiers in charge of them.

The first settlements in Australia thus founded were necessarily exceedingly corrupt; and this corruption was increased by every fresh batch of convicts afterwards sent out to them. The first free settlers arrived in New South Wales in 1798, the concessions granted to them consisting of free passage, free gift of tools and implements, free gift of land, supply of necessary provisions for two years, and

supply of convict labour for the same period for purposes of cultivation. Besides free immigrants, many of the old soldiers and officers, and some of the released convicts, had grants of land given to them; and six years later, in 1804, a batch of Scotch Presbyterians went out, who established themselves near Portland Head, holding out a praiseworthy moral example to the piebald community around them. Almost the first respectable settlers were thus Scotch farmers, whose industry was crowned with the greatest success. After this, free settlers in small batches continued to go out from year to year, till the tide of immigration attained its full strength, the batches increasing in number, and taking out with them the luxuries and refinements of the mother-country, if not also a modicum of her wealth.

In their infancy, the colonies, of course, suffered greatly from various privations and disabilities. Famines were frequent and factions perpetual where the people were generally depressed by poverty, and where their morals were necessarily very low. The first difficulty to overcome was to make the colony produce a sufficiency of food to supply its wants; and it took some time to make farmers out of pick-pockets. But the natural fertility of the country was so great, that no difficulty of this sort could last long.

In 1821, the convicts in New South Wales formed more than two-thirds of its entire population; in 1828, they were hardly more than half; in 1833, they were about one-third only; and in 1839, less than one-fourth. From 1840, New South Wales ceased to be a place to which convicts were sent. After this, especially from 1847, the tide of immigration became almost continuous, the culminating point being reached in 1851, when the cry of "Gold in Australia" caused a rush of adventurers, which resulted in the rapid construction of towns and cities, and in the formation of an adequate government. Centuries would have scarcely sufficed to give the colonies that population and that fair start into existence which the cry of "Gold" called forth.

Long previous to this date the colony began to break up into sections as the dimensions and capabilities of the territory came to be understood, and as the number of settlers began to multiply. The divisions now are seven—namely, New South Wales, Tasmania or Van Diemen's Land, South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, West Australia, and New Zealand, the whole being known by the general name of Australasia. Van Diemen's Land separated from New South Wales in 1824; South Australia in 1836; Victoria in 1851, in consequence of the "gold fever;" and Queensland in 1859. The Swan-River Settlement, or Western Australia, has existed as a distinct colony from 1829, and is known as the least prosperous of all the colonies, though it has been rising in prosperity in recent years. Its natural capacities are not inconsiderable, and the climate is healthy; but the rapacity of the upper settlers, and the bad faith of the labouring classes towards their masters, early converted it into a scene of misery and desolation. Seeing that it did not prosper, the colonists themselves petitioned for the transportation of convicts to the settlement, which was willingly acceded to, as all the other colonies had by that time refused to take any. For a long time this was the only portion of the continent to which criminals were conveyed; but the concession had eventually to be withdrawn at the entreaty of the inhabitants of Victoria, who resented the coming among them of runaway or liberated convicts from the west.

The case of New Zealand is somewhat dissimilar from that of the other settlements. It is about the latest in the order of colonisation, but almost the first in the prospects of success. The forests in it are abundant, its water-carriage is splendid, and the capabilities of the soil are unrivalled. The colony has necessarily greatly flourished, and would have flourished yet more, but for the unfriendly feeling that subsisted in it for several years between the English settlers and the natives. The former are called Pakehas, and the latter Maoris—a bold people, who derive their

descent from the Malayan race. For some reason or other the two races were, in times past, unable to agree. The missionaries did a great deal of good in the country, but the conduct of the Pakeha traders was such as to wipe off the favourable impressions they left; and a war to the knife was carried on for several years between the contending parties, which threatened to exterminate the Maoris, to the eternal disgrace of the English name. This fear has since been happily set at rest, and it is to be hoped that the peace which has been made will be lasting, which is sure to lead to the most splendid results. The colony was formally established in 1840; the number of European settlers in it amounts to about four hundred-thousand; the number of Maoris yet living is about forty-five thousand.

Leaving aside the exceptional case of the Swan-River Settlement, the success of colonisation in Australasia has been unprecedentedly signal. Everywhere the advance has been steady, in some places astounding; and it has been great in all respects—social, commercial, and agricultural. The climate of the country differs widely in different places, as it must where the area is so extensive; but much the greater part of the territory best known is healthy and agreeable, while some places are regarded as the best in the world, especially portions of New Zealand, which are considered to be very favourable to longevity. The fertility of the soil, so far as the coast-line on which the several settlements have been made is concerned, has already fully vindicated itself. All the country that yet remains in a state of nature is known to the colonists by the expressive name of the “bush,” and the capabilities of these tracts remain to be ascertained; but, in the places already colonised, most of the productions of Great Britain are raised, and many others, especially cotton, which will not grow in Britain. The chief wealth of Australasia, however, consists in its flocks and herds; and the rapidity with which these will increase is marvellous. Millions of pounds of wool are annually exported to England from a quarter

where there was not a single sheep before the colony of New South Wales was started some eighty-nine years ago. Cows and horses thrive well, but best on natural pastures. A few tame cattle having strayed away from one colony into the bush, were found in a few years to have multiplied into a large herd on the thick and luxuriant grass that surrounded them. The mineral products of the country are at the same time various and considerable. The gold-mines of Victoria and Queensland have already reduced the value of gold all over the world. Copper and lead have also been discovered, and the mines are being worked successfully; and coal likewise has been found, particularly in New South Wales. All things taken together, the colonies have run a race of prosperity unmatched in the annals of any nation. The entire resources of Australia have not yet been discovered; but it has already been found that a vast population can be maintained in it in comfort, even though the central parts of the island should prove to be utterly uninhabitable. The total population of all the colonies already amounts to about three millions, while the total revenue raised in them is about sixteen millions sterling. The extent of land under cultivation is above four and a half million acres, by far the largest portion of it being in South Australia and New Zealand. New South Wales has the largest stock of horses, and Victoria the largest after it. In cattle also, New South Wales takes the lead; but Victoria has the largest number of sheep. The total value of exports amounts to about forty-four millions a year, and the total value of imports to about forty-seven millions. Nor is the importance of the settlements to be appraised wholly by their commercial worth. In them England is refounding herself in the East, as she is doing in the West in Canada; and when the mother-country shall have ceased to exist, she will still live in her children, perhaps even then the most dominant race in the world.

The form of government in Australasia was at the outset the same in all the settlements, the Governor representing

the British Crown, and carrying on his duties with the assistance of councils appointed by the Crown. But, subsequently, the English Government wisely conceded to the colonists the privilege of framing constitutions for themselves; and this permission they have availed of by setting up their own representative assemblies, and appointing their own responsible executive officers. The constitutions framed are nearly, though not precisely, alike. In New South Wales and Queensland there are two Houses of Parliament, of which one is composed of Crown nominees, and the other of members elected by universal suffrage. The constitution of New Zealand is very similar, and the House of Representatives in it includes four Maori members. In South Australia and Van Diemen's Land the old legislative councils have been reorganized and a House of Assembly created, the members of both of which are elected by the people. Western Australia is administered by a Governor, having a council of twenty-one members, of whom seven are appointed by the Crown and fourteen by the people. In Victoria both the legislative chambers are elected wholly by the colonists, the Governor acting only as their chairman; so that virtually the constitution of Victoria is purely democratic, at the same time that it is thoroughly loyal. The safest course for all the settlements is to continue to adhere to the constitution of the mother-country as closely as the difference between their respective positions will allow. Sooner or later they will probably become confederated, like the Dominion of Canada.

The advance in social matters in Australasia has been considerable; but that in literature, the sciences, and the arts, has been less, for the simple reason that the universal scramble for wealth did not allow of much time being devoted to such pursuits. This, however, promises to be remedied in due course. The preparatory steps towards improvement have already been taken, and schools and universities have been set up, which are said to be almost as good as those of the mother-country. Everything, in fact, wears a smiling prospect; even crime, in a population

partly descended from convicts, being less in proportion than in England. The only one drawback to be regretted is the antagonism between the white race and the aborigines, where it does exist, for which no remedy has yet been discovered. In the English colonies this has not assumed the proportion it has attained in the United States, the principle that the race of barbarians must perish if incapable of civilisation being, at this moment at least, an exclusively Yankee one. In Van Diemen's Land, the natives, after much contention, have entered into a peaceful agreement with the colonists, to which both parties have faithfully adhered. The colonists in Australia proper have not been altogether as considerate; but the interior of the island is so extensive, that colonisation and barbarism may yet for a long time find ample room in it to cultivate the triumphs of uninterference, if not of concord. In New Zealand only did philosophy and humanity appear at one time to be unequal to tolerate the vices of the Maori character, which raised the question whether British philanthropy, placed under temptation, was really better than that of the Americans; and it must be added that this point has not yet been finally determined.

The Minor Colonies.

Among the minor colonies of Great Britain are the West Indies, the west coast of Africa, the Cape of Good Hope, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Mauritius. It is scarcely necessary to refer to any of these in detail. The West Indies will always be remembered in connection with the frequent fighting there between the English and the Spaniards in the olden times, out of which grew the subsequent colonisation of the American continent by England; and also for the grand buccaneering expeditions of the great English captains, Drake and others, who, in their day, imitated the adventures of their ancestors, the vikings, and contributed largely, in that way, to the downfall of the Spanish power. Later, these islands, the abori-

ginal population of which perished early under a system of forced labour, became the theatre of that traffic in slaves in which England was the last to participate, and which she was the first to abandon; for which her name will be remembered when all her battles and conquests shall have been forgotten. The west coast of Africa was the great field of the slave-trader during the times referred to, though its chief attraction now is on the Gold Coast, where gold is collected in small quantities. The Cape Settlement belonged originally to the Dutch, but after hard fighting was ceded to Britain, in 1815. Its limits were subsequently extended by the addition of Kaffraria, the inhabitants of which had been enemies to the Dutch, and were, for that wise reason, treated as such by the English, till they were compelled to submit and become peaceful subjects. Ceylon was the island-home of the giant Ravana, whose conquest by Rama has been immortalized by Valmiki. The more modern name of Ravana's city was Anurádpóra, the ruins of which covered sixteen square miles, and exhibited remains of splendid architecture, of which some stoutly built of granite are yet extant. The island was first held by the Portuguese, and afterwards by the Dutch, from whom it was wrested by the English in 1795. The Straits Settlements were also acquired from the Dutch; Hong-Kong from the Chinese; Mauritius from the French. Where, in all the world, can we point to another empire as extensive, and which is now as hopeful and flourishing, as that of which the dependencies have been named?

England with her colonies is great among the greatest powers, though without her colonies she would not be so little as some people are pleased to imagine. Almost all these colonies are inexpensive to the mother-country, and self-reliant; the total value of their commerce, including both imports and exports, already exceeds one hundred and fifty-five millions sterling a year; and yet have they been frequently complained of as encumbrances, and every now and then the question is raised and discussed of allowing them to go free. If they really sought their in-

dependence England could not oppose their wish, as she did in the case of the United States. The lesson then learnt has in all respects been a salutary one, and cannot be forgotten. The loss of America did not impair the greatness of England; and it is well-understood that the loss of Canada and Australasia would not do so now. Whether free of her or not, the interests of the colonies would for years remain identical with those of the mother-country, and the material loss to the latter would therefore be nominal. It looks better, however, as it is; the Queen of the Deep occupies her natural position when girt round by powerful dependencies; and no cause has yet arisen for throwing them overboard so long as they are unwilling to part from her.

The cry of the defencelessness of the colonies has been frequently raised in support of the proposals to abandon them. It is asked—"If war breaks out, can England protect them all?" Perhaps not: but that is no argument for sending them adrift. With an empire so wide as hers, England cannot possibly have appliances ready to defend every place immediately at need. But if her appliances of defence be incomplete, no other nation has the necessary appliances of offence to place her in difficulties. It is true that England cannot at one and the same moment protect all her colonies, east and west. But where is the enemy able to attack them all? Absolute security in case of war for a dominion so widespread can never be pre-arranged. But England can do what no other power can do equally well: she can at once close all the ports of her most offensive enemy, and prevent his doing mischief, till adequate defences are improvised. Even this would leave the commerce both of the mother-country and her dependencies exposed on the high seas; for a universal commerce can never be adequately protected. It is for this reason, and this only, that England so meekly puts up with insult and annoyance from the more quarrelsome powers. In this sense, but in none other, is the extent of her dominion the cause of her weakness.

CHAPTER IV.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

WE do not give precedence to the United States of America over France, Germany, and Russia, under any impression of the superiority of the former over any of the latter, but simply that our notice of the Anglo-Saxon race may be continuous and uninterrupted.

The first colonisation of America from Europe appears to have been made by the vikings or Normans, in the tenth century, after they had founded settlements in Iceland and Greenland. The discovery of Iceland is attributed to a Norwegian freebooter, who was obliged to leave his native country on account of his lawlessness, and whose son, Eric Red, following his example, was outlawed from Iceland, upon which he went out and discovered Greenland. From this last-named place Lief, the son of Eric, passed over to Newfoundland, and afterwards to the American coast, where he explored all the tract between the present site of Boston and that of New York, founding a colony which was named Vineland, on account of the abundance of grapes there met with. In the fifteenth century, the rediscovery of the continent was made by the Cabots, enterprising merchants of Bristol, who visited the coast of Labrador in 1496, four years previous to which Columbus had discovered the Bahama islands. The thorough colonisation of the country was begun after this by the Spaniards, who were followed by the French and the English—the first colonisation by the English dating from the reign of Elizabeth, when Virginia was discovered by Raleigh, and settled upon.

The wrongs that the primitive possessors of America suffered at the hands of the colonists have never been fully made known. Our knowledge of those races is, in fact,

altogether very meagre; and extraneous inquiries about their origin, &c., have thrown a veil, as it were, over the history of their sufferings. We do not understand the theory of migrations; and, as the American Indians do not much resemble any of the races of the Old World, we are content to believe that they are not descended from Noah and his descendants, that their origin was spontaneous, and that this was the case almost all over the world—every nation being, as a rule, the product of its own land at the outset. The name of Indians was given to the American aborigines by the Europeans who settled in their country, who supposed the tracts they colonised to be on the way to India; for which reason also the first discovered portion of America was called the West Indies. The treatment which the natives received from the colonists was almost uniformly extremely cruel and unjust. The greatest portion of the lands taken from them were taken by violence; setting fire to their dwellings was frequently resorted to for compelling their flight; and those that did not run away were disposed of by the sword. Even the companions of Penn did not hesitate to follow this well-approved course.

The history of the first days of the colony at Virginia is relieved by the poetical tale of Pocohontas, the daughter of Powhatan, an Indian chief of that locality. Pocohontas saved the life of an Englishman who had been captured by the chiefs of her race, was herself captured by an unprincipled adventurer, and at last found a deliverer in another Englishman, who converted her to Christianity, and married her. The childlike goodness and innocence of her character have been praised as much as her loveliness. Was she the only one of her race so endowed? And yet the Indians have been extirpated, when, like this woman, they might have been rescued and civilised. The result of the marriage, we read, was peace with the Indians, which, at the commencement of the settlement, was of course much prized. But this feeling did not last long; the English despised the Indians as savages, and were not

assiduous for unions with them; by degrees animosities came to be fully developed on both sides: and this was uniformly the aspect of affairs in every place.

The colonisation of Virginia was followed by that of Maryland, Massachusetts, New Plymouth, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, which were known collectively by the name of the New England States. They were recruited, on the one hand, by convicts, and, on the other, by those who fled from the persecution of bigotry in England. These latter, known as the Pilgrim Fathers, were the bone and sinews of the settlements formed. It was their vigour that strengthened and supported all the colonies. At first their one dominant wish was to Christianize the natives; but this humane feeling soon gave way to a so-called *bonâ fide* conviction that the Indians were naturally, as well as figuratively, the children of the devil; and they accordingly treated them as such—not only with contempt and abhorrence, but also with undisguised severity.

The Pilgrim Fathers first landed in America on the forbidding shores of Cape Cod, in the winter of 1620; and their first act was the drawing up of a voluntary compact of government. They received no power of government from the Crown, but continued to exercise every authority till they were incorporated with the province of Massachusetts, in 1691. Bancroft says that they were the knights of their age; but this is not wholly true. Of most of them it has been correctly asserted that they were merely the Jesuits of England, and nothing more. Similarly, the settlers in Virginia are erroneously understood as having been of the best blood of England. What is true is that the cavaliers who migrated thither were the younger sons of families whose wants exceeded their means; while the bulk of the immigrants was formed of convicts, who preferred crossing the Atlantic to being strung up at home. Distinguishing the distribution according to the religious beliefs of the immigrants, it may be generally laid down that Virginia was colonised by the Roman Catholics, the

New England States by the Puritans, and Pennsylvania by the Quakers.

Simultaneously with the English colonies referred to, were developed the French colonies in Canada, which, as we have mentioned in the preceding chapter, were taken by England in 1759. This, which secured to England the empire she now holds in America, was also, in a great measure, instrumental to the loss of the United States. At the close of the war with France, England found herself burthened with a large debt, which rendered it necessary for her to raise money by colonial taxation, on the pretext that the maintenance of her armies was necessitated by the requirements of her colonies. There had been bickerings before this time between the mother-country and her bantlings in respect to the right of the former to interfere with the government of the latter, and to regulate their commerce; but heretofore the proximity of the French in Canada had kept the discontented in wholesome fear of, and in dependence on, the parent state. This fear was now removed, and the mine being ready for explosion, the spark was not late in coming to set it on flame. A new impost having been proposed in the form of a stamp-tax, the colonies denied the right of Parliament to impose duties and taxes on a people who were not represented in it. There is no doubt that they had a right to say so. They had planted themselves on a foreign soil to avoid oppression in the mother-country; they had grown up almost in perfect neglect and without any thought of them on her part; in the hour of trouble they had assisted her in her wars with France, so far as the acquisition of Canada was concerned. They had just cause, therefore, to feel aggrieved when threatened with burthensome taxes to be imposed at the imperial will.

Their grievances now took a tangible form. Ten of the colonies joined in a congress, which met at New York on the 7th October, 1765, and drew up a declaration of rights and grievances, in which all the privileges of Englishmen were claimed by them as their birthright, one of the most

important of which was exemption from taxation unless imposed by themselves. This had the desired effect: the Stamp Act was repealed. But, to vindicate its honour and importance, the Parliament simultaneously passed a "Declaratory Act," avowing the principle that Parliament had a right to bind the colonies in every respect. The whole virtue of the concession was thus nullified. The Act for taxing tea, glass, paper, &c., imported into the colonies, which followed soon after, reopened the question in all its bearings; the attempt made to enforce it was resisted; affrays between the citizens and soldiers exasperated opposition; and at last the disputes matured into a revolt. The declaration of independence was signed on the 4th July, 1776, by the thirteen States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. It soon received the support of foreign powers, particularly of France smarting under the loss of her American possessions. At the eleventh hour England expressed her willingness to make all the concessions asked for by her colonies, except the acknowledgment of their independence; but the recusant States were now conscious of their strength, and refused to treat unless their independence were recognised. The English Government is said to have descended even to the offering of bribes in their endeavours to get back their dependencies. To one general in the American army, named Reed, a bribe of 10,000*l.* and a fat appointment in H.M.'s service were offered. "I am not worth bribery," said the General proudly, in reply; "but such as I am, the King of Great Britain is not rich enough to buy me."

The struggle that followed was obstinate. The English had to carry on war at the same time with America, France, and Spain; besides which, all the northern powers of Europe formed themselves into an armed neutrality, prepared to strike in against them the moment they were weakened enough for the blow. The hands of England

were also full of wars in India ; and the general opinion of the world was so adverse to her cause, that the republican ranks were filled by volunteer recruits from all countries, not excepting herself. Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, the first battles between the disciplined forces of England and the raw levies of America were almost invariably decided in favour of the former ; and the English generals had already begun to write home that the subjugation of the colonists was all but completed, when the tide veered against them, as they might have anticipated from the outset it would, considering that one party was fighting for their rights, and the other for continuing a forced control over a population already four millions strong. A contest morally so unequal could possibly have had no other termination than that which was secured by the surrender of Lord Cornwallis to General Washington on the 19th October, 1781.

The independence of the United States was a relief to Great Britain. The colonies had long become a source of expense and internal involvement to her, and the distractions of a distant and divided political administration had become irritating. The question of right in the quarrel of course lay on the side of the Americans ; but England's wish to coerce them was at the same time very natural. The struggle was obstinate and prolonged, but eventually the Americans won, mainly through the bravery of their German mercenaries and the devotedness of the French, and not solely, as they are now so anxious to make out, by their own exertions.

The independence of America was formally recognised in 1783, and the formation of the federal constitution completed in 1787. Of the original States ten out of thirteen possessed, down to the time of the Revolution, forms of government resembling that of the mother-country, the Governor representing the royal power, a Legislative Council the Upper House of Parliament, and a General Assembly of Representatives the Lower House. The remaining three States—namely, New Hampshire, Con-

necticut, and Rhode Island—were, from their first organization, democratic in temporal affairs, and in spiritual matters recognised liberty of conscience and freedom of worship as among their fundamental laws; and it was on the principle of this minority that the federal constitution was based. The first union of ten States was called the Revolutionary Government. The next union of thirteen States formed the Government of Confederation, which undertook and finished the war, and signed the treaty by which their independence was acknowledged. But it was not able to do anything more; it could not pay its debts, or even its current expenses. To form a permanent union, and accommodate the opinions and wishes of the delegates of the several States essentially differing in several respects, required further deliberation and patient management, and was finally accomplished by the convention of 1787, by which the constitution was thoroughly reorganized, and the interests of the different States merged in those of the nation, Washington being elected President of the Republic.

Thus did the Americans make themselves a new nation in the new world. Sprung from the English stock, they soon drew to themselves immigrants from almost all parts of Europe, notably from Germany, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, and France. The native-born Americans partake largely of the English character, and are intelligent and active, though not to the same extent as Englishmen; but they rarely possess in fulness the corporeal stamina of their ancestry. The rest of the population, particularly of the Northern States, is considerably inferior in all respects, and altogether very heterogeneous; and virtually the Americans are at present only an aggregation of races, and not a distinct nation by themselves. They have not had time, in fact, to coalesce and grow together into one nation; they have not even acquired a proper name to go by. The designation "Yankee," the Indian corruption of "English," has long ceased to be applicable to them, as they have dis-acknowledged England; and the name "American" is

much too wide and indefinite to fit them precisely. They have nevertheless fully vindicated the revolution by which they became independent. They have not only shown themselves to be quite competent to take care of themselves, but have, in the midst of the passions and dangers of democracy, and, for a long time, with the stain of slavery fastened on them, become a great power, with all the prognostics of a gigantic destiny. There is now no doubt of their daily growth to greatness, and of their being destined to great things, provided they remain faithful to themselves. But they spoil their own good name by a very large amount of unnecessary gasconade.

The peace concluded between Great Britain and the United States after the Revolutionary war remained undisturbed till 1812. Intermediately, several questions arose between them in respect to which they reproached each other. The English right of search gave particular offence, and the Americans were again the first to declare war, which they did with their usual foresight, while the mother-country had her hands full of differences with Canada in America, and with Napoleon I. in Europe. But the contest now was not in the cause of liberty, but had originated only from a spirit of rivalry and defiance; and, the premises being different, the results also were dissimilar, as compared with those of the first war. On the ocean the fortune of the combatants was nearly equal; while on land the Americans invading Canada were repulsed, but successfully repelled in their turn the aggression that was made on their territory, though not till Washington was captured, after which peace was concluded, in 1815, upon England agreeing to surrender the right of search.

A long era of tranquillity succeeded, which enabled America to make rapid strides at improvement. The greatest activity was displayed in the opening out of roads and canals to connect the Western States, the great lakes, and the extensive valley of the interior with the Atlantic seaboard; the agricultural and mineral resources of the country were developed with persistent energy; very con-

siderable improvement was made in manufactures and mechanical appliances; commerce was so widely extended that, almost like England's, the flag of the United States is to be seen flying in every part of the world; a mercantile marine was created which at this moment counts thirty-two thousand vessels, including lake and river craft; while the progress in population and wealth was equally great, the first having increased from four millions at the time of the Revolution to thirty-eight millions—of course principally by immigration.

The great mania of the Americans yet is for increase of territory. They have already secured large possessions, both by purchase and compulsory occupation. Texas was annexed on the merest pretext, which led to a war with Mexico, and, as Mexico was unable to fight with them on equal terms, the final result was the further annexation of the provinces of New Mexico, Utah, and California. But even this did not satisfy them. Advancing into the wilderness, the Americans have everywhere displaced the poor Indians, whose hunting-grounds have been usurped and subjected to the operations of the plough, and who have been branded as pests and savages for resisting the march of American progress. In this the Yankees have exhibited their resolution and unscrupulousness to the greatest advantage, without betraying any inordinate share either of conscience or sensibility. Of course the country thus assumed has been, or is being, covered with flourishing settlements and substantial farms, with all the indications of comfort and prosperity. An industrial population now covers long areas where there were no inhabitants before; but it is not to be forgotten that patent rights have usurped the place of moral rights, which have been unmercifully ignored. To the thirteen States owned before have been added eighteen others—namely, Maine, Vermont, Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Missouri, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California. Besides these, additional territories known as Oregon, Minnesota, Utah, New Mexico, Nebraska, &c.,

have been acquired; and thus the territory of the Union has come to be extended from sea to sea. The Yankees, nevertheless, still hanker for further extension to the north and south; for Canada on one side, and Cuba and Mexico on the other. The States acquired are already filling up with white settlers and their comfortable dwelling-houses and well-tilled fields; but the question still arises—Where are their old occupants gone? “*Las Casas*, help me to believe in God!” was the exclamation of the benevolent Spaniard, when he witnessed the outrages perpetrated by his countrymen on the red-men of Peru. Has not that belief vindicated itself? What is Spain now? What her position in the scale of nations? Where is she hastening to? Is that not a lesson deserving to be read by the most go-ahead nation of the modern world? Great has been the expansion of the United States; marvellous the history of her prosperity. But the fall may yet be as signal as that of Spain. At every place the Indians have been basely treated, defrauded of their possessions, tricked in every bargain, and remorselessly hunted from place to place; and all this has been done so calmly and plausibly, that *prima facie* there is no evidence of much injustice having been done to them. It is even pretended that civilisation was offered to the Indians and refused; offered at the butt-end of guns and in brandy-flasks. Did they misread such civilisation when they rejected it as synonymous to perjury, violence, robbery, and murder? There are still about four hundred-thousand Indians in the territory of the United States—one-half of whom are hostile to the States; and it is not long since that the President in one of his messages said that he would hunt these to death. It is hard that the original children of the soil should thus be exterminated by those who have forcibly assumed what belonged to them; but civilisation—American civilisation at least—will not tread with barbarism on neutral ground.

The other great curse of America was slavery, which has only recently been abolished. At England's door lies the original guilt of having introduced it in the North

American States, it having been imported by her into Virginia in 1620, or simultaneously with the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on another spot. But nobly did England afterwards expiate her guilt; while America dared not for a long time look the evil in the face, and, even so late as 1838, passed a rule in Congress that no petitions for abolition were to be read. In fact, the impression in the United States all along was that they could not do without slaves—even Washington and Franklin were slaveholders; and nothing but a civil war would have destroyed the anomaly of a people professing to be free in the extremest sense of the word, still struggling actively against the emancipation of the slave.

The civil war came. The people of the American Union were at this time divided into two great parties, distinguished respectively by the names of Democrats and Republicans, the latter including the Liberals and Abolitionists of America. The increase of this second party in the Northern States had for a long time been regarded with fear by the Southern States. The alarm was completed on the success of the former in the election of a President of republican proclivities, namely, Mr. Lincoln, who was particularly disliked by the latter. All hopes of an honourable adjustment of differences between the two parties were now believed to be extinguished, and the Southern States at once made up their minds to secede; and on the 19th December, 1860, South Carolina, taking the lead, proclaimed her secession—Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia following suit in January, 1861, when the Confederate flag was raised. This act was not unconstitutional, but the Northern States refused to allow it. The war was not waged by the North in any degree in the interest of the slaves; the northern people despised the negroes; they were better prized, at least as chattels, by the people of the South. The war was waged solely for the preservation of the Union, for the maintenance of the integrity of the empire. If it had been possible to obtain this object without enfranchising the slave, the rule

of bondage would have continued to be maintained. The Northern States were sixteen in number, the Southern fifteen; the area of the former in square miles was about six hundred and thirteen thousand, of the latter, about nine hundred and fifteen thousand; but, while the population of the Northern States was above twenty millions, that of the latter was only about twelve millions—including negroes; and among this smaller population the Northerners endeavoured to create a division by declaring the negroes free.

At the commencement both parties were without standing armies, except a few regiments kept for watching over the Indians. But the Federal States, being much more populous than the Southern States, were able from the commencement to throw out against the latter a continuous human tide, which the South had but slender means to resist. The North had also great advantages in equipment, manufactories, and railway communications; and, from its naval superiority, its commerce remained unharassed except by occasional privateers, while the trade of the South was ruined, its coasts invaded, and its rivers converted into thoroughfares. Against all these odds the Southern States had to contend, and did contend most manfully. They fought against armies twice as numerous as their own, while their ports were strictly blockaded, which deprived them of supplies. If England and France had aided the Southerners, as was suggested by Napoleon III., it would have been all over with the Union. But the forbearance of England was not appreciated. The Americans had come to suspect that it was she that had stirred up the Southern States to revolt, and even all the *Alabama* damages which have since been paid by her have not satisfied them fully. One thing is certain, that the weakness of America has now been discovered. The vitality of the South has been established; the discontent in it, it is known, is only stifled, not put out; and the probabilities are extremely great that, sooner or later, the civil war will of itself be renewed, perhaps with greater

asperity than before,—a crisis which may be accelerated at any time by the assistance of other nations, if they choose to interfere. The division of North and South existed from the days of Penn, when the Puritans of Pennsylvania quarrelled with the Roman Catholics of Maryland, and Lord Baltimore settled their conflicting claims by a boundary line which was in effect the same, so far as it went, with that which recently separated the Federals and the Confederates. A little encouragement to the Southerners can make this division more indented and permanent.

The subjection of the South emancipated the slaves. The Southerners, of course, have not received this result as a blessing. Heretofore the slave population in the South, though not so numerous as the white population, was sufficient to relieve the latter of every kind of drudgery, and converted them virtually into a sort of aristocracy, at least as far as leisure, wealth, and distinction could do so. This position has now been altered. The freedom obtained by the slaves is being properly asserted. The women of the negroes have, for the most part, already ceased to work on the plantations. They are now, generally, usefully employed in school-teaching, shopkeeping, needlework, &c.; and, as the wants of the race are very moderate, a little amount of labour is sufficient to raise the money absolutely required for their support. Labour, which the whites in the South were habituated to regard as a disgrace, they are now obliged to share in; and as a large part of plantation-work can be done by low-class labourers only, the need of attracting such immigrants has become great, and many inducements have had to be offered to them. But, besides this, no other difficulty has arisen. Before the emancipation, one party prophesied that the slaves on being set free would die out or be exterminated, neither of which alternatives has been verified. Another party predicted with equal confidence that the black population would, in that case, supplant the white: but this also has not come to pass. Occasional differences at particular places have arisen between the two races, and will arise, from time to

time; but they have nowhere assumed the character of a State difficulty of any real importance.

The present position of the United States is undoubtedly prosperous; but this prosperity is attributable only to their unlimited resources, and to the peculiarity of their position. The condition of the States is not analogous to that of any country in Europe. They have all the advantages without any of the disadvantages of the Old World. They are not straitened for room, nor exhausted of means; they have no neighbours to distrust, and consequently no armies to maintain; they are daily receiving all the redundant energies of the Old World, and are not overstocked with drones. Their only great competitor in similarity of position is Australasia, the soil of which is capable of supporting immigrants even better than that of the American States, and to which the tide of emigration has in consequence been increasing. But America has the advantage of being more easily reached from Europe, and at an expense which is within the means of almost all classes; and the sources of employment in it are also more varied and abundant than at the antipodes. These, however, are the only advantages on the American side: America derives none especially from her constitution.

The only two systems of free government now in existence are the English and the American, the latter of which was, as we have seen, established in direct antagonism to the former, and professed to be an improvement of it. The American Congress or Parliament consists of a Senate and a House of Representatives, with a President, who combines in himself the functions of king and prime-minister as existing in Great Britain. The Senate is composed of two members from each State, chosen for six years; the House of Representatives of members chosen for two years, the number from each State being determined by the census taken every ten years. The former are selected by the States represented, the latter by the people. Apparently these arrangements would seem to be not unlike those in force in Great Britain; but the actual difference

between the two systems is nevertheless very great. In the United States the frequency of elections, the great diffusion of the franchise, and the allowances granted to the members of both Houses, cause a class of men to be elected the majority of whom have no independent means consistent with their position; whereas the British House of Lords consists of members of great independence and honesty, and even the House of Commons is replenished by men of competence, who are sufficiently independent to preserve a high tone of feeling and principle. The ultra-democratic idea that all men are born free and equal may read well on paper, but is simply absurd. All men are not born free, but under certain limitations, which exist in every government; nor are all men born equal, either in natural gifts or abilities, or in social position. It is a truism to assert that all men are equal in the eye of the law, which very truism owes its origin to the fact that all men are not *born* equal. Some distinction in selection is, under these circumstances, absolutely necessary; and the absence of it in America has not been particularly beneficial to her. The British Legislature is the most respectable association in the world; the American Legislature is no better than a congregation of rowdies.

According to Thiers, the American Republic is an "experiment." It has been more properly named by others an "accident." "Honour," says Montesquieu, "is the basis of a monarchy, and virtue the basis of a republic;" but the best existing model of a republic has not a very large share of either one or the other, the government being in the hands of a majority represented alike by dishonesty, vice, and meanness. No better men could have anywhere been found than those who signed the declaration of independence less than a century ago. No worse men can be pointed out in any country than those who regulate the destinies of the United States in our day. The deterioration is remarkable; the corruption general. The officials commit every misdemeanour short of stealing, because their salaries do not maintain them; the entire

administration is in the hands of political adventurers, paupers, and criminals. This does not augur well for the permanence of the constitution; still less does it encourage imitation. The Americans are very anxious to see democracy established in Europe. The only way to secure that end is to purify their own institution—to make it worthy of adoption.

The crudities of the constitution are also great. The theory of the Union is that the Congress at Washington is only a congress or council of States for the management of their foreign or inter-State affairs, each State retaining its full sovereign authority in domestic matters. It is not a distinct establishment from the States, with separate interests and divided objects. It is merely an instrument for executing the will of the country at large, its functions being performed by men bound by local interests to particular States. This is at best but an exceedingly cumbrous arrangement. It is well adapted to the present wants of the United States, but would be totally unsuited to the wants of the more polished and civilised nations of Great Britain and France. Even in America it is doubtful if it will suit a more thickly-populated territory; and people who talk of introducing it in England talk very heedlessly indeed. The permanence of the institution in America itself is doubtful. It has been hitherto sustained only by the geographical position of the States, their immense extent of territory, which is very sparsely populated, and the pride of that independence which was fought for and won, which has induced the people to adhere to the institutions they started with. The country in its present state has been correctly called the paradise of mediocrity, and its institutions are suited to that state only. When the limits of mediocrity are passed, the institutions will have to be recast and purified.

As regards the forms of administration, the difference between the British and American systems is not very great, for the simple reason that almost all the American forms of any value have been borrowed from Britain.

Trial by jury, the law regarding Habeas Corpus, inviolability of domicile, the independence of courts, the subjection of every act of the executive to the ordinary operations and restrictions of the law, the distribution of power among the local and popular bodies—all these are British institutions and privileges, which the Americans have adopted at second-hand. With these for foundation-stones, they have attempted to set up a more ostentatious superstructure than the British constitution; but the edifice thus raised is not likely to bear the wear and tear of everyday use as well. All the good of the American system is confined to what they have borrowed from the mother-country. They abuse the mother-country in unmeasured terms, and are always ready to keep up a quarrel with her; but they carefully copy all her time-honoured institutions, just as much as they imitate her in every branch of manufacture and industry. "You are good for nothing, old hunks; and I will kick you out of eternity. But I like this and that which you have got, and which no one else can boast of, and I shall certainly appropriate them." Nor could America do anything better than copy Old England in all her ways. If she did so carefully, she would soon be able to correct many of her present deficiencies.

In the matter of civilisation, America is particular deficient, and assuredly very far behind England. It is unfortunate that all comparisons of America should be with England, to which the United States are inferior in almost every respect. The contrast would not be so great if the States were juxtaposed with most of the other European countries. Golovin, a Russian by birth, though afterwards naturalized in England, may well be accepted as an unprejudiced witness on behalf of America. "An American," he says, "is an intoxicated Britisher who keeps his feet in the air, speaks through his nose, and spits over people's heads; who aims at money-making, little caring for such a trifle as respectability." "I do admire," he continues, "the Pilgrim Fathers in search of a remote spot for the exercise

of their faith; I admire their children fighting for their independence: but I declare that their descendants are making bad use of their freedom." This, even to the present day, is the opinion of every independent observer. Where Presidents are insulted or beaten, there can be no real respectability. It is true that attempts against the sovereign's life are not uncommon in other countries also; but we do not refer to assassinations and treasons. In other countries sovereigns reign by monopoly, and may and will have enemies in men prompted by fanaticism, madness, or despair. The President of the United States is, on the contrary, chosen by the nation he represents, and ought to reign in their hearts and affections. Yet even this officer, so especially selected, sits not only in constant dread of the bowie-knife and the revolver—a common fear of all potentates—but also of the whip and the cane!

Again, Golovin remarks that in America "one must be anvil or hammer, dupe or swindler, more than anywhere else. One-half of the people cheats," their victims being those who come from other parts of the world. "Out of *three* Yankees there are *four* swindlers!" "Swindlers in the North, slaveholders in the South, and border-ruffians in the West, constitute the white population of the 'glorious and great country' which boasts to be the leader of mankind." It is certain that America is not a better edition of England, as the Americans would have it. She may be called a more enlarged edition, so far as extent of territory is concerned, but she is in all other respects an exceedingly vitiated edition. The Anglo-Saxon evidently deteriorates with transplantation. He has at least done so in America and India, and, to some extent, in Australasia also. Possibly unlimited licence calls out his worst passions into play, passions which cannot develope to the same extent in the mother-country.

Swindling in America is swindling *par excellence*; but it is not swindling only that we have to notice. New York has been called the Sodom of modern times; in it adultery and abortions form the fundamental items of news and

talk among all classes. Golovin says of persons of the middle class all over the United States, that "four or five of them combine to keep a woman in common, and know the hours when they ought not to knock at her door;" and again, "that they keep women in public houses, quite as one would keep a horse at the livery stables." Who shall affirm that the state of things has become better since? The keepers of bad-houses have repeatedly declared before their own courts that their best customers are married people of both sexes; and there is no doubt that the street-females of the United States are more immodest even than those of London and Berlin. Mormonism was only an improvement over this state of society; nor could it have taken root anywhere except in America.

The other patent defects of the Americans are the absence of refined manners, the absence of gratitude, and the total negation of heart, feeling, and benevolence. The first—the want of refined manners—has been attributed to the want of a Court. There are handsome houses, fine furniture, expensive clothing, but all devoid of that taste and refinement which confer elegance on them in the Old World. Cooper vindicates his country on this head by urging that, if there be less of refined manners in it than elsewhere, there is also less of rusticity, the extremes of society in it not being so much separated as in other countries. This vindication is not worth much. It admits the main charge, that a very high elevation of manners has not been attained. Of the absence of gratitude, the best evidence, perhaps, is in the conduct of America towards England. It is worthy of remark, also, that the debt of America to France was never repaid, on the mere pretext that Louis XVI. fought, not for the American republic, but for the humiliation of England. "Look not the gift horse in the mouth, but thank the giver of it," is not a principle either acknowledged or appreciated by the Americans; and yet the gift horse, in this instance at least, was a good horse, in the shape of a fleet and army, and considerable

sums of money, without which it is doubtful if the cause of independence would have been so easily won. As for heart or benevolence, nothing more cold and callous than their treatment of the slave question, nothing more heartless and fiendish than their treatment of the Indians, can be conceived.

Nor has democracy developed the intellect of the nation fully. With a large development of revenue, population, agriculture, shipbuilding, &c., there has also been an extensive cultivation of literature, the sciences, and the arts, but no great superiority of standard in either has yet been attained. The best literature of America is only equal to the second and third class literature of England. The Irvings, Prescotts, Bancrofts, Coopers, and Longfellows do not rise higher than the ordinary run of authors in Europe. The number of newspapers published is very great, considerably in excess of the number published in England; but the trash they disseminate is for the most part not only inane, but mischievous, and would not find admittance in journals of the lowest class in London. One reason of the number being so great is that the States are distinct, and, journalism being rampant everywhere, every State requires distinct vehicles of its own. The demand for circulating libraries is very inconsiderable, a clear proof that useful reading is not much appreciated. In England the people are afraid of one thing—public opinion; but the Americans are indifferent to it, and their public opinion is so low that they could not be otherwise. The best check against national debasement does not therefore exist among them.

For all these reasons, an individual Yankee has not yet become a very elevated specimen of the human race; but congregating in numbers, the Americans form an element of great strength. They collect together and combine on every occasion, and for every purpose; and this combination has made them the most enterprising people in the world. Hence their strength for great undertakings, hence their stupendous railroads and canals, and their vast clearances of wildernesses. For everyday improvement in

private life they have no genius; self-reliance as an individual virtue is not very prominent among them. But, as a nation, they are very pushing and independent. For all that, however, the leading characteristic of the people is caution, and utility the standard by which everything is weighed. They have not much originality of conception, but are very clear-sighted and practical, and are always active in improving what others originate. Great ingenuity has been displayed by them particularly in all mechanical arts, though the finish of the English producer has not yet been equalled.

As a young nation, America is sensitive to criticism; but we have not read the American character simply to find fault with it. It has many redeeming traits. In America, more than anywhere else, a man is the founder of his own fortune. It is no bar to a man's preferment that his parentage is unworthy. A disreputable father does not disgrace a worthy son. Rank there is none, beyond that accorded to the temporary possession of some elective post, which does not confer particular respect or regard. The wealthy merchant, the successful manufacturer, are looked upon as Nature's aristocrats, and well-prized. In America again, more than anywhere else, service does not demean. There are *helps*, not servants, which is certainly less degrading to human nature than the servile relations as they exist in other countries. For this reason, also, the servant classes are of higher status, and even respectable people will take service.

The natural associations of the people are English. The recollections of their descent, their connection with English literature, their extensive commercial relations with England and the English dependencies, are calculated to make them English. But this tendency is repelled by an unnatural effort, the stereotyped plea for which is that the wars waged between Great Britain and the United States were all provoked by the conduct of the former, and that the injuries inflicted by her do not admit of being forgotten or condoned. But this surely is a most absurd plea. The

right assumed by the mother-country which led to the Revolution was certainly more than an injustice—for it was a mistake. But having led to resistance and final success on the part of the Americans, they, to say the least of it, have nothing more to resent. The real cause of American ill-will is their deep-seated envy of the greatness of England, which eclipses the greatness they have yet been able to attain. A candid acknowledgment of this feeling would cover them with shame; and so they mouth, and gibe, and gesticulate, and make show that they do not care a bit for England's pretensions, and are only anxious to make her smart for the wrongs she has done them. To the envy of the American people generally is to be added the hatred of their Irish section against England, which accounts for the eager desire expressed by all, in season and out of season, to get up a war between the two countries. It is not, as some explain, a mere party cry. The wish to exchange blows does exist. But with the wish there also exists the conviction that nothing would be gained by such a contest—not even the coveted possession of Canada, and that the loss on the American side would be at least as heavy as anything the Americans could inflict on England.

Brag apart, how does the question really stand? Are the Americans prepared to fight with England, or with any great European power? They have not soldiers enough to man their fortresses, nor navy sufficient to protect their ports; and, with the South in chronic disaffection, it would seem that a few vessels like the *Alabama* would suffice to dissolve the Union for good. The fact is, their long prosperity and immunity from great wars has blinded them; they require some disappointments and defeats to cure them of their overweening presumption.

The missions of England and America are very distinct. The geographical position of the former is circumscribed, but she has adopted as her mission the exploration and peopling of the distant wildernesses of the earth. America has no similar call; her wildernesses at home are large

enough to engross all her energies. To clear her forests, till her soil, and utilize all her resources without looking beyond her ocean limits, except for commercial purposes, is her destiny. No two countries could have objects so dissimilar; there is no cause, therefore, why they should quarrel. That they emulate each other in commerce can be no reason for their being at loggerheads for ever.

It is scarcely likely, however, that the Americans will get cured of their distemper soon. Not all the unconcern of England, not all her politeness, not all her attempts to please, have smoothed the ruffled temper across the Atlantic. The *Alabama* concessions of England had no object but to mollify the irritation of her largest customer; the nation of shopkeepers were not afraid of the bravado, but solicitous to preserve the custom of their buyers beyond the ocean: but even those concessions have not elicited a single response of kindness. It seems unnecessary, therefore, that England should trouble herself further on the subject; and it is time now that the use of such terms as "Brother Jonathan" and "Uncle Sam" should be discontinued. The feeling implied is not reciprocated, and it is humiliating that England on her part should still be at pains to avow it. Money being well appreciated on both sides, to pounds sterling and dollars should be left the preservation of peace between the two countries. Sufferance and soft words are simply thrown away.

If she be true to her destiny, America ought, sooner or later, to be able, from her natural resources, to outrun England in all agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial enterprises; but this, allowing a longer interval, is equally true of Canada and Australasia. In all three cases such development is merely a work of time. That America precedes the other two in the race is only because she has had the earlier start; but the prospect in her case is scarcely as clear as in theirs. Her present prosperity is undoubtedly great; but we must not allow it to hoodwink us. She has pushed on her population into the wilderness,

opened new channels and created fresh markets for her traffic, called forth heaps and heaps of new cities into existence. But there is a bee in her bonnet already; it is very doubtful if, constituted as the United States are, they can long be true to themselves. The history of the world, as we read it, seems to indicate most plainly that the distinctions "Federalists" and "Confederates" will not die out, and that as much blood will be drawn out of both yet as was shed in the olden times between England and France, and between France and Germany. The continuous development of the greatness of the country will depend on the fulfilment or otherwise of this prophecy. We make a present of it to the Americans, whether they receive it kindly from us or not.

CHAPTER V.

FRANCE, OR THE *GRANDE NATION*.

THE history of the *Grande Nation* is one of the most remarkable chapters in the annals of the world. With a civilisation in advance of all other countries, with an intelligence second to none, with aspirations for liberty which have nowhere been equalled, France, throughout the entire period of her existence, has hunted only after shadows—after grandeur, glory, and renown—without ever being able to secure more than a moderate share of political independence and social happiness. Naturally, the country has a compact appearance, and the people inhabiting it have always been sympathetic, powerful, and homogeneous, apparently intended by Providence to wield a sovereign influence in the world. But the vanity, fickleness, and impatience of the nation have uniformly perverted the tendency of that intent, not only to the detriment of France herself, but also to the detriment of all her neighbours. The political life of France has consisted merely of a succession of spasmodic efforts to grasp at that which cannot be secured except by patient and persistent exertion; and her social condition has been that of a fire-raiser enjoying the mischief created by himself. A country which gave birth to Montesquieu and Fenelon, to Pascal and Des Cartes, cannot be said to be unable to produce solidity of thought and maturity of judgment; but it is nevertheless true that the nation at large has invariably betrayed a total want of capacity to understand anything that is not absolutely superficial, and has never yet been able to manage with practical intelligence any really efficient government that aimed to secure both liberty and happiness. Theoretically, no one

appreciates liberty better than the Frenchman; practically, no one in Europe has been a greater slave.

Of the very old history of France we know nothing. The same tradition that makes Britain a settlement of the Trojans, speaks of Greek settlements on the Mediterranean coast, near the mouth of the Rhone, of which the chief was Massilia, now called Marseilles. But our historic knowledge of the country does not go beyond the age when it was occupied by different Celtic tribes, among whom the Gauls were the most prominent, being particularly known for the many inroads they made into Italy, in the northern parts of which they eventually settled under the name of Cisalpine Gauls. This led to the resolution of the Romans to beat back the barbarians and subjugate their country, which was achieved by Julius Cæsar in the manner narrated in his Commentaries, and which forms the first great fact in the history of France.

The Romans ruled over Gaul for four hundred and fifty years, during which they effected considerable improvement by their tutelage, at the same time that they enervated the character of the people by their refinements. It followed, therefore, that when the conquerors were obliged to retire from their dependencies to defend their own country, the Gauls were unable to offer any effectual opposition to the German nations that assailed them—namely, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, and the Franks, after the last of whom France was called.

The settlement of the Franks, or Freemen, in France was effected in the fifth century, and forms the second important fact in French history. The first king of the tribe in France was Clovis, who was converted to Christianity by his wife Clotilda, a princess of Burgundy. Clovis ruled also over Franconia, the possession of the nation in Germany, so that the rulers of France from the commencement of her history did not reign over France alone, a circumstance which led to much confusion and fighting in subsequent years. The policy of Clovis permitted the Franks to intermix freely with the Gauls; he also allowed

them to intermix freely with the Britons, when, flying from England before the Saxons, they settled on French land in the province called after them Brittany or Bretagne; and it was by these means that the Celtic element was made to predominate in the people of France.

From the accession of Clovis to the extinction of the Carlovingian race, the history of France consists only of a series of petty wars and uninteresting events. The feudal system was introduced into France with the Merovingian rule. The lands wrested from the Gauls were equally divided between the conquerors, probably in the same manner as the spoil and personal effects. In the assertion of this right no special deference was paid to the chief by his followers. It is said of Clovis that a vase of extraordinary beauty having been carried off from a church in Rheims, which the bishop of that city wanted to get back, the king entreated his army to present it to him over and above his own share of the booty, upon which a fierce soldier rushing forward smashed the vase with his battle-axe, saying: "You shall receive nothing here but that to which the lot gives you a right." The lands taken were divided among all the chief's followers on the principle of military service; but beyond that service they contributed nothing. The property acquired was considered to belong so absolutely to its owner that even the sovereign power was equally divided between the sons of Clovis after him.

The dynasty of Clovis was succeeded by that of Charles Martel, or the Hammer, whose father, as Mayor of the Palace, had wielded the regal power during the obscure reigns of several Merovingian princes, whose characters have been fully described by the expressive epithet *lazy*, while all their names have not been rescued from oblivion. Arrangements of this sort are familiar to us in India, where the Peishwás of Central India in the time of the Mahrattás actually ruled over the kings by whom they were employed, and where in our day Jung Báhádoor was all in all in Nepál, though nominally the king's prime-minister only.

The powers assumed by Martel were well deserved. In the growth of a little more than a century, the religion of Mahomet had pierced into Europe and subjugated Spain; and, becoming bolder by success, had now crossed the Pyrenees, and was marching rampant over France. To France and Martel belongs the honour of having rolled back the tide. The Saracens found themselves for the first time oppressed by the robust stature and reckless courage of the warriors who opposed them; the weighty strokes of the "Hammer" forced them to fall back; and thus was the further expansion of Islámism in Europe prevented. The Pope recognised with pleasure the service rendered to Christendom, and sent to the victor the keys of the tomb of St. Peter, and proclaimed him Consul of Rome. But he died shortly after; and the clergy, who resented the freedom with which he had applied the revenues of the Church to the defence of the Christian religion, proclaimed, on the unimpeachable authority of a vision beheld by St. Eucherius, Bishop of Orleans, that the body and soul of the defender of Christendom were burning in the abyss of hell! The words of St. Eucherius are, that he saw "Charles Martel with Cain, Judas, and Caiaphas, thrust into the Stygian whirlpools and Acherontic combustion of the sempiternal Tartarus!"

The first great aggrandizement of France was the result of the prowess of Charlemagne, the grandson of Charles Martel, who saved Christian Europe from subjugation, on one side by the Moslems intrenched beyond the Pyrenees, and on the other by the pagan Saxons who ravaged eastern France from the Rhine to the Moselle. The Moslems were attacked by Charlemagne in Spain, and a part of that country occupied, which effectually checked their expansion; but this hostile demonstration did not prevent his illustrious contemporary, Kaliph Haroun-al-Raschid, the head of the Moslem race, from exchanging civilities with him by sending an ambassador to salute him. The Saxons were overpowered by him in their homes, and on one occasion he beheaded as many as five thousand of

them—a barbarity which was execrated even in that age, notwithstanding that it materially furthered the cause of Christian conversion. By these successes he was enabled to unite all the countries and races of the West; and for this service he was crowned Emperor of the West by the Pope—a distinction which proved very unfortunate in the sequel, as French kings were not wanting in later days to emulate the greatness and glory of Charlemagne, which kept the country always involved in wars with Germany and Italy. At the time of Charlemagne the constitution of France was a consultive monarchy, and the sovereign never failed to ascertain the will of his subjects in all things that concerned them, particularly in respect to the wars intended to be waged. But the despots who subsequently emulated his achievements were not so particular. They plunged their people headlong in bootless struggles without consulting anything but their own pretensions and predilections, silencing the opposition of judgment and discretion by that magic word “glory,” the witchery of which no Frenchman has yet been able to resist.

The mighty empire of Charlemagne was split up into distinct principalities under his descendants; and, correctly speaking, his grandson, Charles the Bald, was the first king of France. It was in the reign of this prince that the Norman invasions of France began to become troublesome; and by the time of Charles the Simple, the French found it convenient to compound with the invaders by giving up to them the province of Neustria (Normandy), Rollo, their chief, consenting on his part to be baptized, to marry a daughter of the king, to yield homage for the lands he held, and to accept the distinction of being one of the twelve peers of France. This arrangement was so far beneficial to France that it infused new blood into the country, in which martial habits and virtues were already falling into decay. A fusion of races did not immediately take place, but the west of France became repopled by a mixed and valiant race, well able to resist any aggression on the French empire, either from Germany or from any

other direction. On the other hand, the murderous character of the Normans was improved; they adopted the religion, language, and usages of the French; and, already efficient as soldiers and sailors, they now sat down to acquire the skill and tastes of artisans. It was these Normans and their children—not the French—who, within a hundred years after, crossed over and conquered England, just as they had acquired Normandy before, both Saxons and Franks being compelled alike to make room for them.

The universal weakness of the laws at this period gave rise to the birth of Chivalry. The chronicles of Robert the Devil, of Normandy, afterwards known as Robert the Magnificent, seem to indicate that Chivalry sprang with him, as it was his policy to espouse the cause of the weak. But it appears more probable that this distinguishing feature of knighthood originated with the preaching of the clergy, who first directed their efforts to the same end. Unable to accomplish their object by themselves, they adroitly made protection of the weak a virtue of the knight, and introduced vows and ceremonies to make the injunction impressive. Devotion to the fair was at the same time easily blended with a warrior's duty, being only a further extension of the first principle; and this aided immensely in raising the character and position of the sex. In time other principles were added to the code, such as courteousness of manners, endurance of hardship, &c.; and they were all promptly accepted, not only by the Franks and Normans, but throughout all Europe. To France belongs the high credit of having diffused this spirit widely; and it was she also that reaped the greatest benefit from it. The formation and perfection of the language of France is attributable to it; her intellect also received a great impulse from it, especially as respects the development of poetry; and the character of her people was at the same time refined. Nor did the refinements thus originated terminate with the institution by which they were called forth. The sentiments of Chivalry were imperceptibly

adopted by the respectable classes in all countries, and even to this day illustrate the feelings of gentility and education.

This was also the age of the Crusades ; and the exhortations of Peter the Hermit and the Pope were most promptly echoed back from France, whence the enthusiasm for war rapidly extended to other countries. To use the words of Anna Comnena, all Europe, torn from the foundation, seemed ready to precipitate itself in one united body on Asia. "God wills it," "It is indeed the will of God," were the shouts of myriads ; and young and old, rich and poor, knight and plebeian, girded with equal earnestness for the fight. Seven crusades were organized. It does not matter that Palestine was not rescued ; that the fightings carried on for nearly two hundred years were accompanied by a large amount of suffering, loss of life, and expenditure ; that they also cherished a fierce spirit of fanaticism and intolerance. The advantages derived from them were much greater. They brought men and races into intercourse with each other, broke down prejudices, gave birth to an enlarged system of commerce, suggested friendly combinations and political alliances, and contributed largely to the expansion both of civilisation and intellect. France also owed to the Crusades the acquisition of Normandy, Maine, and Anjou, which Philip Augustus, taking advantage of the rashness of Richard I., and the weakness of his successor, John, was able easily to resume from England.

The chivalrous feelings of the age greatly contributed to produce the Crusades ; and the Crusades, in their turn, reacted on Chivalry and fostered it. Several orders and associations of knighthood arose among the crusaders, the members of which united the character of monks with that of warriors—probably without improving either. But a combination of this kind was one of the necessities of the age ; and these orders supplied that necessity by furnishing additional illustrations of practical chivalry. They professed celibacy and poverty, and performed religious duties

at the same time that they exercised themselves in arms, guarded roads from robberies, and afforded protection to the weak. The two principal orders were the Knights of the Temple, and those of St. John. In the course of time, many persons of rank and property entered these fraternities, making over to them all their private estates. It was then that the governments of the countries to which they belonged, or in which their headquarters were located—notably the government of France—began to accuse them of great crimes, with a view to deprive them of their possessions. It is not that the orders were ever so bad as they were represented; but the necessity for their existence having gone by, it was found profitable to abolish them; upon which the estates of many were forfeited to the king.

After the Crusades the history of France is taken up by a century of desolating wars, carried on with it by England, in support of the idle claim to the French throne set up by Edward III., by right of his mother Isabella, a French princess, which was barred by the *salique* law. Previous to this period there had been no very serious hostility between the two countries, which was rather fortunate than otherwise for France, as the Norman kings of England were very powerful and spirited, which their contemporaries on the French throne were not. The wars now commenced were carried on through the reigns of five French and five English sovereigns. The French had the advantage of fighting a war of defence in their own country, notwithstanding which the English had invariably the advantage over them for several years. In almost all the actions that took place, the French displayed their usual contempt alike of danger and discipline, and the English their cool and deliberate intrepidity. The sufferings caused in France were not less deplorable than the wicked and angry passions which were excited, and the lasting resentments which were established. From this time forward *perfidé* Albion and France were almost always at daggers-drawn; but the result of the hostilities

between them in every age has proved incontestably the impossibility for either country to crush and subdue its opponent.

The victory of Agincourt was followed by the treaty of Troyes and the elevation of an English prince (Henry VI., a minor) to the throne of France, the Duke of Bedford acting as regent. This triumph, achieved after ninety-five years' fighting, seemed to realize for a time the dream of Edward III.; but it was exceedingly short-lived—the power of the English being overturned by a poor enthusiast, Joan of Arc, who imagined that she was inspired of heaven to avenge the miseries of her native land. Her enthusiasm having aroused the patriotic ardour of her countrymen, and, at the same time, impressed the English soldiery with fear, the result was the expulsion of the English from France, though Joan herself fell into the hands of her enemies, by whom, with the characteristic enlightenment of the age, she was cruelly burnt at the stake. The English now retired finally from France; but, with a persistence which aggravated the bitterness already existing between the two countries, the title of King of France was retained by the King of England till the time of George III.! Among the lessons that the French learned from the English in these wars was the use of archery, which at this period was little known except in England. Edward III. is also said to have used firearms for the first time in the battle of Cressy, the same being then unknown in France, though they had been in use from an earlier time in Spain, where both Moors and Christians made use of gunpowder, the knowledge of which the former had brought with them from the east.

During the wars with the English—a short time after the battle of Poitiers—the misery of France was heightened by a rising of the mob, called the Jacquerie—the first popular revolt in the country mentioned in history. For a long time the peasants had groaned under the oppressions of their masters, and latterly had also ceased to be protected by them. They now rose *en masse* to avenge their wrongs,

with the cry of "Death to gentlemen!" The castles of the nobles and gentry were set on fire and levelled with the ground; their wives and daughters were ravished and murdered; the nobles themselves were slain under exquisite torments, one of them being roasted before the eyes of his family, who were pressed to partake of the roast. "Saracen or Christian," says Froissart, "never committed such iniquities." Frenchmen alone were capable of them, whether in the age referred to or in later times; the horrid and the barbarous make up the natural elements of the French mob. The nobles at length collected together for their mutual defence. Ten thousand of the mob were destroyed by the Duke of Orleans; twelve thousand by the King of Navarre. But there were nine thousand more at Meaux, which they had invested owing to the consort of the Dauphin and several other ladies of quality having betaken themselves thither as to a place of safety. The age of chivalry had not yet passed by, and knights and nobles from all directions eagerly flew to the rescue of the trembling dames. Their gallantry was successful; the peasants were routed with cruel slaughter—their insurrection drowned in blood: and this has always been the characteristic feature of civil dissensions in the country.

The evils of the feudal system in France were very early developed, and converted her into a mere knot of disjointed feudatories and duchies—such as Guienne, Flanders, Gascony, Toulouse, Burgundy, Vermandois, Bourbon, Normandy, and Bretagne—to fuse which together into one integral dominion taxed for many years all the energies of some of her greatest sovereigns. Louis XI., though individually contemptible, distinguished himself greatly in this work, and was rewarded with much deserved popularity for his determinate opposition of the barons. To avert the danger which threatened them, the great feudal lords formed themselves into a league, which was pompously called the "League for the public good;" and, selecting Charles of Burgundy as their leader, they defeated the king at the battle of Montherly. But the death of Charles

shortly after, in a war with the Swiss, threw all the advantage again in the hands of the king; and the resistance of the barons being now circumvented with greater ease, a deathblow was given to the feudal system, which died out in France at about the same time when it expired in England. Of the great fiefs, Normandy was broken into subjection, while Burgundy, Bourbon, and Bretagne were annexed, the last in the reign of Francis I., by whom it was acquired by right of his wife, and merged in the Crown. At a later date, in the reign of Louis XIII., the work of finally crushing the nobility into subjection and establishing an irresponsible sovereignty, was carried out by Richelieu, who broke down the fabric of provincial feudalism by encouraging the residence of the barons in Paris in extravagance and luxury. He personally gave them an example of costly and luxurious living; the bait was eagerly caught; and they soon lost not only their provincial character, but also the means which had supported their power, and so ceased to give trouble to the Crown.

The breaking up of feudalism and personal service led to the organization of armies regularly maintained and paid, and this placed the king and his people altogether in a new relationship with each other. The tide of absolute power now set in with great strength in all places, and nowhere in greater strength than in France, where the authority of the sovereign became positively unrestricted. The task of domestic pacification was easily completed; the king, at the head of an army all his own, was soon everywhere hailed as the father of his people; and he was thus enabled to plan new acquisitions and distant conquests. The attention of Louis XII. was entirely engrossed by the affairs of Italy, and the whole reign of Francis I. was a contest for supremacy with Charles V. of Germany. The contention of Francis and Charles was particularly significant. They had both aspired to the emperorship of Germany, and professed, at least at the outset, to carry on their rivalry with emulation, not enmity—Francis, with a natural suavity of manner,

describing it as a competition for the hand of the same mistress, which the more fortunate lover only could win, but the loss of which the rejected lover was not at liberty to resent. The success of Charles gave rise to different feelings. An endeavour was made by an alliance with Henry VIII. of England to balance the power of Charles; but this led to nothing beyond a meeting between the two kings at a spot near Calais, which, from the splendour of the two courts, was called "the field of the cloth of gold;" while Charles forestalled Francis by seeing Henry previously at Canterbury, and by securing the good offices of his minister Wolsey by a promise of the papacy. In the wars that followed, fortune, as Francis complained indignantly, failed him. His great general, Bayard, was killed, and he himself became a prisoner after his defeat at Pavia, when he wrote to his mother—"All except honour is lost." That also was lost soon after; he was liberated on conditions which were never fulfilled. But he suffered more deceptions from Charles than he practised on him: and thus they struggled on, neither gaining any material advantage over the other; Charles being barely able to maintain his supremacy in countries of which the population repudiated France, while Francis, obliged to abandon Italy and the suzerainty over Flanders, received nothing to counterbalance his loss.

The era of Francis was that in which the Middle Ages expired, and his endeavours to patronise and foster literature and the arts were well-sustained. But, on the other hand, he set his face against the Reformation of Religion, which was spreading rapidly in Germany and England; and his cruelties to the professors of the reformed doctrines, especially to the Waldenses of Piedmont, threw France an age behind the times. Providence was not opposed to the development of great things in France; but France herself was not true to the destiny designed for her, and even Providence exerted itself on her behalf in vain. In the reign of Louis VIII. the Albigeois of Languedoc anticipated the reformation of Luther, but were hunted to death for the

open profession of their heretical opinions, many thousands of men being destroyed by the sword. To despatch and root out the rest with celerity the Holy Inquisition was established, and conducted by the monks of the order of St. Dominick with an atrocity, deceit, and cruelty that has never been surpassed even in barbarous and pagan lands. In the reign of Francis the persecutions were on the same scale, and some three thousand persons were massacred for adhering to their religious belief. Notwithstanding such treatment, the Protestant religion made much progress in the country during the three succeeding reigns, and many illustrious converts were made, among whom were the king of Navarre, a principality between France and Spain, the Prince of Condé, and Admiral Coligny; but this only plunged France deeper in sanguinary excess. Her fury culminated in the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the assassinations of Blois, when the atrocities of 1792 were more than anticipated. Up to this time England and France had been running the race of civilisation and enlightenment together. It was now that France fell back, while England pressed forward under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. The persecutions in France repressed free and enlightened inquiry; they did more, for they implanted those seeds of political convulsions which attained such luxuriant growth in subsequent years.

The wars commenced by Francis I. were continued by his successor Henry II., the object held in view being the same. The Rhine border has been the hobby of France from the earliest times, the idea entertained being that the natural boundary of France on the east is the Rhine from its mouth to its source, and thence along the crest of the Alps to the Mediterranean. For the realization of this idea Henry II., who was persecuting his own Protestant subjects, undertook to defend those of Germany against their emperor, and with their connivance occupied by treachery Toul, Verdun, and Metz, which at the end of the war he was allowed by the peace of Château Cambresis to retain, to be fought for over and over, as they have been in

later days. In the meantime the flames of civil war kindled by religious rancour blazed high, and the confusion was increased by the thunders of the Pope launched on the head of those who had presumed to arm themselves against the Crown.

The assassination of Henry III. brought forward a turning-point in the history of France. Was France now to have a Catholic or a Protestant king? Henry of Navarre, the nearest male heir, was a heretic. His claim to the throne was therefore contested by Philip II. of Spain, the son of the Emperor Charles V. The difficulty was got over by Henry agreeing to sink his religious convictions in deference to the wishes of his Catholic subjects, which at once put an end to a desolating war, and transferred the sceptre from the house of Valois to that of Bourbon. Henry did not, however, desert the interests of his Protestant subjects, though he compounded his own conscience for the throne. He became a convert to Catholicism with the settled purpose of thereby establishing toleration in religion at least throughout the country; and by the Edict of Nantes he secured to his Protestant subjects the free exercise of their religion, and an eligibility to all offices of the state. The other benefits conferred on the country by him were equally great. At his accession to the throne the kingdom was disunited; he succeeded in cementing the provinces together by his policy: the nobles, who were haughty and discontented, were humbled by his valour; the people, who were clamorous and oppressed, were conciliated and relieved. With the assistance of his minister, Sully, he was the first to introduce order into the finances, and discipline into the armies of France; new manufactures were established by him, and new colonies planted; and, while he restored peace and plenty at home, he rendered his kingdom great and formidable abroad. The power of Spain was checked by him; and he meditated designs against Austria with a view to prevent her finally from disturbing the peace of Europe, when the life of one of

the best sovereigns France ever had was cut short by the hand of an assassin.

The reign of his successor, Louis XIII., was famous for the vigorous administration of his minister Richelieu, who, like several other of the greatest ministers of France, was drawn from the cloister, and exchanged the crosier for the seals. The war with the Huguenots was reopened by him, but immediately after he supported the Protestant cause in Sweden and Holland to secure possession of the country between Champagne and the Rhine. He quarrelled also with England, Spain, Italy, and Austria; his principle being the same with that adopted after him by Napoleon I., that no country could be great that was not actively engaged in successful war. The people he compared to mules, who were not to be left too much at their ease; the nobles, if not serviceable in war, were held to be utterly useless, and deserving to be reduced to the rank of the mules: and he humbled both at the same time that he established discipline and order among them. But the success of his arms and projects brought no real strength to France; freedom, which is the life of a people, was crushed out by him; and all his exertions only paved the way for that absolute despotism which was attained in the reign of Louis XIV.

The minority of Louis XIV. was distracted by a contest for the office of minister between two cardinals, Mazarin and De Retz, in which the former triumphed. The early part of this reign was also distinguished by civil wars, known as the "wars of the Fronde," waged against the government by certain princes and nobles who felt aggrieved at their exclusion from high offices. The contest was carried on with the Frenchman's characteristic levity; the erection of barricades in the streets was diversified with fun and laughter; the partisans changed sides constantly, till a formal pacification took place, upon which the Fronde was dissolved.

After arriving at maturity, Louis assumed the reins of

government himself, and established a pure despotism, to which the nation cheerfully submitted. In Languedoc, very tyrannical measures were taken by him for exterminating the enemies of the Church, as many as ten thousand persons being put to death with cruel tortures—an operation which obtained the name of *dragonnades*, from being carried out by dragoons. The Edict of Nantes was also revoked, which forced four hundred-thousand Protestants to quit France for Britain, Holland, Prussia, Switzerland, and America. The loss to France was immense; the gain to the countries to which they went was not less, as the exiles carried with them a knowledge of silk-spinning and weaving, dyeing, crystal-glass making, painting, and watch-making, along with general refinement and intelligence. Another oppression exercised was the issue of *lettres de cachet*, or sealed warrants, of which not less than nine thousand were enforced by the sudden custody of those against whom they were directed, they being kept in the Bastille for years or for life, without trial of any sort in any court of justice. The "Man with the iron mask," of whom so much has been written, was a prisoner of this reign, he having been, as the plenipotentiary of a sovereign prince (the Duke of Mantua), removed from prison to prison with a mask on his face to prevent his being recognised. He was thus kept in durance for twenty-four years, after which he died and was buried in the Bastille, all vestiges of his existence being removed. That this was possible in France at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, is a sad commentary on the character of her people.

With oppressions of this nature every vestige of political independence was swept away. The assemblies of the States-General, a recognised institution since the days of Philip le Bel (1302), in which the *tiers état*, or third estate, met together with the nobles and the clergy, were no longer held; the municipal corporations established since the time of Louis IX. (St. Louis) were now nominated by the Court;

the several districts of the empire were placed under the control of Intendants; the Parliament of Paris was silenced whip in hand, and directed to mind its own business, and not to interfere with the ordinances of the king; and even the courts of justice were dictated to and interfered with at the pleasure of the Crown. The French people submitted to all this very quietly: the court was maintained with great splendour; the attractions of Paris were augmented by the erection of many fine buildings; luxury and taste were cultivated even in the matter of powdered periwigs and ornamental snuff-boxes; learned societies were also established for assisting in the spread of education; and people readily acknowledged that the title of *Grande Monarque*, assumed by the king, was well earned.

Externally a career of aggression was adopted which aspired to the elevation of France by the depression of other countries, and which at one time promised to make Louis master of all Europe. He had brave and experienced generals to fight for him in Condé, Turenne, Luxemburg, Villars, Vauban, and others, and for some time their arms were everywhere crowned with success; but united against him in self-defence were all the great powers of the day—England, Holland, Spain, Germany, and the greatest part of Italy; and the series of victories gained by Marlborough at Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde, and Malplaquet, soon turned the tide in favour of the allies, and led to the peace of Utrecht, the Frenchmen receiving the drubbing given to them with their usual light-heartedness, and consoling themselves with epigrams and satirical songs deriding their enemies. Has not this ever been the distinguishing feature of the nation? The Ethiopian may change his skin, the leopard his spots; the Frenchman his character, never. The result of all these wars was that, at the death of Louis XIV., France was politically and physically prostrate, with her resources exhausted, her trade ruined, her towns depopulated, even her military fame tarnished; yet such was the infatuation of the people that they remained

dazzled by the spurious lustre of his reign to the last. No one monarch ever did more harm to an entire nation than he did, either before or after him.

Apart from the wars which disfigured it, the age of Louis XIV. will be remembered as the Augustan age of France—the age of Pascal, Descartes, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Bossuet, Flechier, Massillon, Fenelon, Fontaine, Rochefoucauld, Bayle, and Le Sage. But what shall we say of the taste of a monarch who banished Fenelon from his court for having written *Telemachus*, which he understood to be a satire on himself? He appreciated nothing but adulation and flattery; and the learned societies which were founded by Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert, were filled by him with men best able to give a gloss to the profligacy of his court. But it is said of him that he patronised the arts and sciences with a liberal hand; the painter, the sculptor, and the architect were well-befriended by him. One other great act of his reign will also be remembered; he gave a most kind and generous reception to James II. of England in his adversity, when he was obliged to run away from his throne.

Louis XIV. was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV. The minority of the latter was disturbed by the intrigues and ambition of the Spanish court, which did not terminate till the fall of Alberoni, in 1719. The administration of Cardinal Fleury, as prime-minister of France, was successful; but after the cardinal's death the king was swayed entirely by his mistresses, Madame Pompadour and others, who seriously imperilled the interests of the State. In this reign France and England were again opposed in the wars for the Austrian succession, and the Duke of Cumberland was signally defeated by Marshal Saxe at the battles of Fontenoy and Laupfelt. The English were more successful in the Seven Years' War which followed, and inflicted great territorial losses on France which she was never able to recover. In Europe, the French were defeated at Minden; in America at Quebec, which resulted in Canada being wrested from them; and in India

they sustained a series of defeats which, by shrivelling up their power there, developed that of Britain. Both in the East and West the chances of France becoming the ascendant power were for many years much greater than those of England. France never wanted heroes at either place to uphold her fame; but, unfortunately, the French are never able to endure reverses, and always sink under them, while Britain as invariably rises greater from her defeats. It was only the want of stamina in the national character that lost to France all her foreign possessions, which once lost were never regained.

The age of Louis XV. was the age of Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, Buffon, Raynal, Rollin, Marmontel, Diderot, and D'Alembert; so that, so far as literary pre-eminence was concerned, the period was nearly as brilliant as the one that had preceded it. Unfortunately, the staff of authors named comprised some powerful and intolerant writers who upheld novel doctrines in philosophy and morals, and treated all questions of political life with freedom bordering on mockery. This unsettled the minds of those who depended on them for instruction, and paved the way for the convulsions which followed a short while after. It is true that the people who caused those convulsions could not read books, but it is also true that they did manage to acquire the sentiments expressed in them and their irreverent *persiflage* at second-hand. The great revolutionary classes were the artisans—not the peasantry. The former learn things more easily than the latter, and observe distinctions more narrowly. Smarting under their own degradation and poverty, they compared it with the effeminate splendour of the higher classes around them. They also saw and felt that the burden imposed on the nation by the wars and expenses of the last two reigns had been unequally distributed, the main portion of taxation to meet it having been imposed on the labouring classes, while the higher classes were allowed to go free. With this knowledge they were now taught to deride the men and institutions whom they had hitherto regarded with respect; and

the idea of "liberty, equality, and fraternity," was thus in a manner forced upon them. The different classes of the community were violently separated from each other. The higher classes laughed at the aspirations of the mob, and at the same time waged war among themselves, the ancient nobility looking down with contempt on the upstart class—the nobles of the robe, as they called them—the statesmen, lawyers, and magistrates, who had secured wealth, bought estates, and acquired patents of nobility. The unprivileged orders—the merchants, traders, and citizens—regarded all titled idlers with equal disgust, and were awaiting with savage impatience the hour for action. What spurred them on still more was the example of other nations before them. The expulsion of the Stuarts from the throne of England was yet fresh in their memory. After that the Americans had risen, and fought for and earned their independence. "What others dare, I dare too," was naturally the cry of the Frenchman. He remembered that he had assisted America in throwing off her yoke. Could he not fight as hard for his own rights? Thus did the storm gather that burst on the head of Louis XVI. Correctly has the Revolution been called a revolution of *ideas*. It was a war of the people against all rights operating against them. It warred against power, privilege, and customs, endangering even real rights and salutary institutions. But the motives were not the less pure because the issue was so unfortunate.

The tempest was foreseen some thirty or forty years before it burst forth, but no attempts were made to avert the approaching danger, because the governments of both Louis XV. and Louis XVI. were equally unfit to deal with the crisis. The latter worked on in its accustomed groove, lulled into a fatal security by its very imbecility. The public income having become inadequate to meet the wants of the state, and the Parliament of Paris having refused to sanction the imposition of further taxes, the States-General, or the assembly of the representatives of the three orders of nobility, church, and commons, was summoned by the king.

The first resolution carried in the Assembly was that they would vote as one body, not as three distinct bodies, and this threw all the power into the hands of the commons, on account of their numerical superiority. Thus was the Revolution virtually commenced. The Assembly next proceeded to assert their independence, and many salutary innovations were made. The first scenes were confined to debates upon the declaration of the rights of the citizens, to the forced abolition of all prerogatives and privileges, and to the repression of all abuses, old and new. A rage for republican simplicity then gave way to an admiration for the English constitution; and, in imitation of it, France was declared to be a constitutional monarchy, with an Assembly to make laws, a limited right of veto being left to the king. But here the purity of the movement terminated: the wild and inflamed populace did not understand bare rights; the men who led them on did not seek for rights only. The provision of veto by the king displeased the mob; and on the 5th October 1789 the insurrection broke out by beat of drum, the people shouting on all sides for bread! In the States-General the Jacobin faction, or violent democrats, prevailed; and, while the mob committed the greatest barbarities in the streets, the Assembly backed them by abolishing the order of nobility, and by announcing that no man was to possess any distinction beyond that arising from his virtues. The terms *monsieur* and *madame* were discontinued; every man was a *citizen*, and every woman a *citoyenne*. The unmitigated barbarism that followed has never been equalled. A people justly proud of their philosophy, literature, and refinement, at once became worse than American and Australian savages. The outrage culminated by the palace being attacked, upon which the royal family was consigned to prison.

The successful revolutionists now assembled under the name of the National Convention, the great leaders of which were Robespierre, Danton, Marat, St. Just, and Condorcet. The king was deposed, tried, condemned, and

guillotined. France was well-pleased, but all Europe was horrified and aghast. The case was not analogous to that of Charles I. of England, for Louis had done nothing to deserve his fate. Prussia had invaded France to prevent the crime, but was beaten back. War was at the same time declared against the other powers that had tried to interfere—namely, Austria, England, Spain, and Holland. The French were prepared to fight against all comers, and well it were if they had been prepared for that only. France was the country where chivalry was born; France was also the country where chivalry came first to be scouted and disowned. Not a spark of chivalry was anywhere elicited when Marie Antoinette was carried to the place of execution. The ferocity of the hour triumphed over all kindly feelings; the queen suffered as her husband had done, her only crime that she was his wife. These were followed by crowds of other victims, old and young, of both sexes, of every rank in life, who were all capriciously condemned and executed. This has well been named in history the “Reign of Terror,” when the Jacobins had everything in their own way, till their virulence was exhausted on each other. It is said that Danton exclaimed in his last moments: “I see that in revolutions the greatest rascal lives last.” That rascal was Robespierre, who was guillotined in July 1794.

The reign of terror was overturned by a second revolution, by which the constitution was reorganized, the government being lodged in two councils—namely, the Legislative Council consisting of five hundred members, and the Council of Elders consisting of two hundred and fifty members, by both of which the executive authority was assigned to a Directory of five members. The republican armies were everywhere successful; Holland was subdued, Spain and Prussia were compelled to make peace, and the general coalition against France was dissolved. But there were still enemies to fight with, in England, Austria, and Italy. The campaign in Italy brought the military genius of Bonaparte into prominence, and compelled Austria to make peace. Since the days of Louis

XIV. the arms of France were never so triumphant as now ; and, elated by their Italian victories, the Directory first formed the design of invading England, which was afterwards modified, at the suggestion of Napoleon, to an attack on Egypt as preparatory to the conquest of India. The battles of the Pyramids and of Mount Tabor seemed to facilitate this design, till the victory of Nelson over the French fleet at Aboukir Bay dispelled the illusion by cutting off the invading force from Europe.

The third revolution was effected by Bonaparte, who, seeing that the game in Egypt was over, came back to France and dissolved the Directory, establishing in place of it a Senate and three Consuls, and becoming the First Consul himself. The ferocity of the first revolution had died out ; people now sought protection from anarchy and violence ; and all hailed with satisfaction a soldier at the head of the state, as able to afford the security that was required. The prestige of the French arms had at this time been well-established. With imperfect means at her disposal, France had withstood a world in arms. She had acquired dominion in Italy, taken possession of Switzerland, made the Rhine her eastern boundary, and was mistress of Holland and Belgium. England, deserted by pusillanimous allies, had been compelled to take to the defensive. A coalition formed against her by the naval powers—France, Russia, and Denmark—she rendered abortive by destroying the Danish fleet. After that, she was once more able to turn the cards on France, and formed another coalition against her which was joined by Russia. Nor was this displeasing to Bonaparte, who was anxious for an opportunity to renew the glories of his Italian campaign. The battles of Marengo and Hohenlinden silenced Austria ; but England was able to wrench Malta from the Consulate, being already supreme at sea. She was also able to defeat the French in Egypt, where Abercrombie gained the battle of Alexandria.

By the fourth revolution the First Consul became Emperor. The frenzy of “liberty, equality, and fraternity” was now over ; the dethronement and murder of a king

and all the attendant horrors, had passed for nought; within twelve years after everything was forgotten, and the nation quietly submitted to military despotism. The wars of the Empire are well known. Aided by generals of real ability, with an army recruited by conscription to any desired amount, Napoleon indulged in dreams of universal conquest. One nation of all the European states, with Paris for the capital of the world, was the utopian idea uppermost in his mind, which he really believed it was his destiny to accomplish. The rapidity of his victories marked a new master in the art of war. Austria was repeatedly beaten, Prussia defeated and overrun, and Russia compelled to accept terms of peace. In Prussia it was the queen who incited the people to resistance; but the men were not equally high-spirited and resolute, and the defeats at Jena and Auerstadt led to the triumphal occupation of Berlin. Similarly, Austria, thrice beaten before, sustained a final defeat at Wagram, which led to the occupation of Vienna, loss of territory, and a crushing indemnity. The old German empire was thus dissolved, and a union of sixteen princes was formed in lieu of it, and taken under the protecting wing of France. The subjection of England was now sedulously sought for, and Napoleon seriously contemplated invading her, and completed the preparations necessary for carrying out his design. But the fleet under Villeneuve, which was to have escorted the invader across the Channel, was intercepted by Nelson, and afterwards destroyed at Trafalgar, and thus was one favourite scheme of the *petit caporal* baffled for ever. He nevertheless continued to issue from Berlin decrees placing the British Isles in a state of blockade, without having ships wherewith to enforce his decrees; and it was afterwards a complaint against Spain and Portugal that they had disregarded these decrees, which led to the occupation of Spain by the French, and the elevation of a Bonaparte to the throne of that country. But the might of England was thrown into the scale on the side of Spain, and, after a hard struggle, Napoleon was checkmated. It is curious that, notwith-

standing his continuous triumph over every other power, his contentions with England were uniformly unfortunate. Whether in Egypt, Calabria, or Spain, the English were always able to resist him effectually, till he was finally overthrown by their "sepoy-general," as Wellington was contemptuously called by him.

Napoleon was an autocrat; but when that is said, all is said that can be said against him as a ruler. France was not then, is not now, fit for anything better than despotism; and as a despot he ruled over her well. The country wanted a capacious mind and a strong hand, and he had both. His civil rule was faultless, and brought order out of chaos and confusion. His military genius did more harm; but it was just the thing France appreciated, and it kept her in good-humour long. His inordinate ambition was his only vice, and wrought his fall. His wish to invade Britain was childish, and it is more than probable that he was himself fully aware that he would never be able to carry out the idea. The invasion of Russia was another mistake. He was not able to conquer her, and came back, not humiliated only, but thoroughly beaten. He might have been a greater sovereign than Louis XIV. but for these fruitless attempts; he can now be regarded only as akin to

"Macedonia's madman and the Swede."

One cause of the great popularity of his military expeditions was the amount of plunder they invariably brought to the country. For a number of years half the public expenditure was thus covered by war contributions, the armies being supported, besides, at the cost of the countries they entered. Half the amount of taxation was thus saved, at the same time that the inebriation of military glory was deliciously enjoyed.

The retreat from Moscow dealt a severe blow; but after it the French were yet able to win the battles of Lützen, Bautzen, and Dresden. The effect of these victories was, however, neutralized by the defeat at Leipsic, which enabled the Prussian and German forces to capture Paris, just when

Soult was being driven out of Spain by the English. A power depending on one man personally has always a precarious tenure. There was no alternative now but for the victor of many battles to fly. A British ship conveyed him to Elba, and the fickle Frenchmen were not sorry that he was thus got rid of. But he turned up again a short time after, when the French of course veered round, or, at all events, the French generals and army received him back with enthusiasm. The hunters around him were also equally alert; all the great powers promptly prepared for a final struggle.

Napoleon returned from Elba in March 1815. On the 16th June he defeated the Prussians under Blucher, at Ligny. Two days after, the two greatest strategists of the age—the “sepooy” and the *petit caporal*—were confronted on nearly equal terms, each at the head of an army of about seventy-five thousand men, on the field of Waterloo. The action was necessarily well-contested; but the issue was not doubtful when the Prussians appeared on the field, upon which the French were thoroughly routed. The power of Napoleon was now entirely prostrated, though, compared with more recent engagements, the battle of Waterloo was only a second-rate fight. France, which had hitherto been so faithful to her chief, notwithstanding the whitening bones of her sons in Egypt, Russia, and on fifty battle-fields, now made a resolute stand against the call for more troops. Napoleon was obliged to abdicate. His subsequent attempt to embark for the United States was frustrated, and at the desire of all the great powers, he was despatched to St. Helena, where he died. The treatment he met with was extraordinary, and not justified by any existing law. He was exiled for life simply as a disturber of the peace of Europe, by those who had him in their power. But there is no doubt that the punishment, legal or illegal, was well-merited. It was in the power of Napoleon to have become a blessing to the country he ruled over; he had many of the qualities which make a great and useful

sovereign: but he chose his part differently, and paid a suitable penalty for having done so.

The fifth revolution was that which restored the white cockade of the old monarchy, by raising Louis XVIII. to the throne on the retirement of Napoleon to Elba. The reign of the king was interrupted for a hundred days on the return of Napoleon in 1815, but was resumed after the battle of Waterloo. It was now that the French for the first time got a constitution which assimilated the government as much as possible to that of Britain, being comprised of a king with a responsible ministry, a chamber of peers nominated by the Crown, and a chamber of deputies elected by qualified voters. They also obtained freedom of the press within certain limitations, liberty of conscience, and equality of taxation. The reign of Charles X., who succeeded Louis, is memorable for the acquisition of Algiers, after the destruction of a nest of corsairs—the pest of the seas; but this only existing dependency of France has always been felt as a grievous burden. The character of Charles was oppressive, and gave rise to a rebellion, or the sixth revolution, by which the king was deposed and banished, and his branch of the Bourbon family declared incapable of holding the throne, which brought forward the younger, or Orleans branch, and placed Louis Philippe on the throne.

A general summary of the Orleans rule is that it was beyond example expensive to the people, and that it did not altogether recognise the public weal as the object of government. On the other hand, a state of peace permitted the development of the resources of the country, and many internal improvements were made. But the king was not liked; and there was a party in existence with strong democratic tendencies. The cry on all sides now was for more freedom, and for unrestricted discussion on political and religious subjects. The French have never understood constitutional agitation; an easily excited populace was quickly carried beyond the bounds of discretion. This inaugurated

the seventh revolution : the streets of Paris were barricaded ; the king being dethroned escaped with difficulty to England, and a republic was set up.

The republic established was soon endangered by the outbreak of social barbarism, very similar to that which had disgraced France from 1792 to 1795. The name of Bonaparte had intermediately fallen into a species of oblivion, but, after the death of the duke of Reichstadt in 1832, was revived in Louis Napoleon, who now came forward to the rescue of France, and was unanimously elected President, in 1848. An eighth revolution dissolved the republic—the people, who were labouring under apprehensions of falling again under the rule of the Parisian rabble, gladly accepting in place of it an arbitrary government, which promised at least to suffer them to live in peace and security. The President now assumed the name of Dictator. He was assisted by a Council of State, a Senate, and a Legislative Council ; but in everything he had his own way and wielded absolute authority, and shortly after he was chosen Emperor.

The second empire was in all material points of good government a failure. It suppressed liberty, impeded thought, and was responsible for the most fatal of modern wars, under which France fell without an effort and a friend. But still it gave what the Frenchman wanted—protection from revolutions, and a fixity of administration. A secure government is France's greatest need ; she cannot afford to be governed by roughs, to be in constant danger of disturbing innovations. This was well-understood by Napoleon III., and his particular anxiety to found a dynasty made him especially quiet and circumspect ; and considerable national progress was made during his reign, and new industries developed. The best service he did to France was to set at rest the national antipathy against England ; he went so far as to establish an alliance between the two countries, and even to exchange a treaty of commerce ; and his rule might have been more successful

than it turned out in the sequel, if the French character had been better formed.

The rock on which he stumbled was the Frenchman's vanity, which has never been equalled. Since the epoch of Richelieu and Louis XIV. France had been accustomed to play the first *rôle* among European nations, and in this claim she was strengthened by the achievements of Napoleon I. The claim was based on her strong politico-military organization, and still more on the classical literature which in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had grown up in the country, and which had made her language and culture supreme in Europe. This pre-eminence France had paraded at all times, and all her sovereigns had always found it convenient to pamper the frailty. Napoleon's reign would not have been worth an hour's purchase if he had adopted a different course. The dance round the golden calf—differently called "glory," "fame," and "*éclat*"—was the tenure on which he held the throne; and the dance-master had no alternative but to lead on the dance. There was first the Crimean war, in which Napoleon proved to the satisfaction of his people that they were in all respects superior, not only to their opponents the Russians, but also to their allies the English—a pleasing assurance, which kept the Frenchmen satisfied for a time. Next came on the war for the union of Italy, in which Napoleon assisted, not for the sake of the object, which he did not care for, but as a quixotic folly that would divert his people in the manner they wished to be played with. Lombardy and the Duchies were wrested from Austria and transferred to Piedmont. This in itself was a great thing for the Frenchman, for it raised him in renown. To humour him yet further, Nice and Savoy were annexed, a rectification of the frontier of France which puffed him up with pride. The emperor's next undertaking, the Mexican war, was a blunder, and ended in misfortune; the Reds looked sour over it, and the nation was discontented. The bold showman had now to make

up for the mischance of the game, and retrieve his laurels. He turned his eyes wistfully to the eastern frontier of France, on which ages of aspirations were based. Since the reconstruction of Germany, after the overthrow of the first empire, war between the two countries had been but a question of time. It had been deferred because the unity of Germany had not yet been fully accomplished, all that the war of liberation (1813-14) had effected being the restoration of a motley group of independent states. The success of Prussia at Sadowa changed the position of affairs by realizing at last the idea of a united Germany. But instead of going to war with a powerful state about it, Napoleon preferred the safer course of claiming black-mail for having kept the peace. Prussia, however, refused to yield one inch of German soil. Even if Napoleon had wished to keep the peace with her after that he could not have done so, for all France—the army, and after it the people—refused to accept the position of a rivalry with Prussia, as head of the German confederation, on equal terms. This was the real cause of the Franco-German war; France fought solely for the championship of Europe. Prussia had long foreseen the contingencies likely to arise, and was armed to the teeth; but she knew how to wait and when to strike. The overweening confidence of France made her less wary. A mere pretext for war was found and taken advantage of with an impertinence and levity of which France alone was capable, and with an inexcusable ignorance of the actual strength of Prussia. The ready hand of the gauntleted Teuton gave back the blow with tremendous effect. After the humiliating defeats which were sustained, the whole blame of the war was attempted to be cast on Napoleon III., who, as dancing-master to the nation, was doubtless to blame, but whose office made it obligatory on him to keep up the dance the nation wanted. It was also attempted to throw the responsibility of the war on Prussia, which, it was alleged, had secretly armed for the purpose. But the real responsibility rested with France alone, which had made no secret of her wish to re-

assume the Rhine boundary at fitting time, and had thus forced the Prussians to be prepared for the occasion. French vanity now required a sacrifice, and Napoleon III. was deposed. The only thing that could save the country, it was thought, was a republic, for which among the populace there was a clamorous demand. This led to her present provisional form of government. It is hard to say where France will land at last.

The Germans, constrained to defend themselves, did so with hearty goodwill. The self-importance of the Frenchman received a terrible rebuff. All Europe had reckoned that there would be a great and formidable rising of the nation after its first reverses, but there was nothing approaching to it. The beating was received more quietly than it would have been received, perhaps, by any other European nation. It was now Germany's turn to claim territorial compensation, and she did so; but what she did claim was not French but German ground, long separated from Germany, but the restoration of which at this juncture was nothing but an act of political justice. It was not, however, as an act of political justice only that it was claimed; it was claimed as an act of political necessity, to render it impossible for France to retaliate, to make the last act the very last. As Carlyle puts it in his own quaint manner: "France has got her first lesson, and well will it be if she can learn her lesson honestly. If she cannot, she will get another, and even another: learnt the lesson must be." For her present position France has none to blame but herself.

The government of France, call it by what name you please, has never been anything but a species of despotism. It is true that the nation has awakened at intervals to a consciousness of its position, and strongly asserted its rights. But the vigour thus displayed was never abiding; and, if it succeeded at times in securing the blessings of equal laws, equal taxation, and the recognition of individual rights, those blessings were surrendered again without hesitation at the shrine of absolute power—either in the

shape of a monarchy or of a democracy—for the fancied prizes of greatness and glory, which the national mind has, in all ages, so devoutly worshipped, such greatness and glory being better prized than half-developed rights and privileges. It is not that the Frenchman does not wish for or appreciate social privileges to the same extent as they are appreciated in other countries. He does want them, and he does appreciate them; but he aspires at perfection in everything; he will not have any privileges in an imperfect state of development,—in such a state as the Briton and the American would, for the time, be satisfied with. He worships the ideal in everything, and anything short of the ideal appears to him scarcely worth having. He calls the revolutions glorious notwithstanding the atrocities connected with them, because of the ideal that was attempted to be secured by them. He will not come down from that elevation of thought to the actual realities of existence. He still believes that his ideal is attainable, that the classes which stand lowest in the social scale, can, and will, be brought to an absolute equality with the higher and educated classes. For such a nation there is no position between despotism and revolution.

The distinguishing traits of the French character are impulsiveness, novelty, vanity, fickleness, and a deficiency of the reflective and moral faculties. The upper classes are more vicious and more extravagant than in other countries; but the middle and lower classes are not so. There is, in ordinary times at least, less drunkenness and brutality among these classes than among their like in other places; and the constantly accumulating wealth of France is the best proof of the industry and frugality of her people. In the contest for superiority in manufactures, arts, and learning, France has been more than a match for Germany, and quite a match even for England. There is no literature so rich as that of France; and the arts and sciences claim a long list of renowned Frenchmen among their best exponents. As in England, however, there has been a decline in the educational standard in recent years, markedly since the

first revolution, and, barring noticeable exceptions, the rage now is for frivolous and undignified mediocrity. The greatest superiority of France over other countries is in her refinement and civilisation, in both of which the post of honour is still her own.

The whole world now wishes a stable government for France. No confidence is anywhere felt in the extraordinary provisional government which has been set up, which is represented by a tottering Executive tethered to a vacillating Assembly. A government on the English or American plan will never work in the country, for the ideas, tastes, and habits required for working it do not exist in France, and sooner or later Imperialism must therefore be restored to it. It is believed that this is also the view entertained by the present President himself, who is only keeping the lair warm for the Prince Imperial till he can come to the fore.

CHAPTER VI.

GERMANY.

THOSE who are familiar with the pages of Gibbon will not require any detailed description of the state of Germany prior to the dissolution of the Roman empire. It will be enough to state that the country so named, from which all the civilised nations of modern Europe derive their descent, was anciently inhabited by a race of hardy barbarians, differently named in different places, but all classed under the general designation of Goths, who, when they united for a common purpose, assumed the name of Alemanni or Germanen, from which that of Germany is derived. They were distinguished by their huge stature, fair complexion, and light-blue eyes, the several subdivisions of the race being variously known as Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Suevi, Gepidæ, Marcomanni, &c., with outlying tribes called Saxons, Franks, and Burgundians. Some authorities make out that all these nations came originally from Asia, probably from the east of the Caspian; while others, with greater reason, assert that they were born in the forests of Germany, whence they migrated eastwards, but were again brought back by the rushing hordes that burst upon Europe from Tartary. They were not all of them savages, but the tribes who pressed on them from the East—the Huns, Alans, Bulgars, &c.—were. Of the German tribes it is said that they had all the virtues of which barbarians are susceptible: the men being valiant, courteous, and hospitable, and the women chaste, meriting the confidence and esteem in which they were generally held. On the other hand, all the tribes were fierce, easily provoked, and always at war, though what they were principally distinguished for was their unconquerable love of liberty, the authority of kings

being acknowledged by certain tribes only, while all reserved to themselves the rights of men. The bravest warriors were selected to lead their respective clans in time of war; and, similarly, princes were chosen in time of peace to administer justice and settle differences among them; but neither leader nor prince had the power to punish with death, to imprison, or to strike.

It has been stated in the last chapter how, on the disruption of the Roman empire, the Franks and Burgundians passed over into Gaul and occupied it. Simultaneously with that movement, the Visigoths passed into Spain and Italy, and the Saxons into Britain, while the remaining races, including such of the Franks and Saxons as were left behind, settled themselves in Germany, or the country contained within the Rhine, the Baltic, the Vistula, the northern mountains of Bohemia, and the river Maine. Christianity was established among these chiefly by Anglo-Saxon missionaries, of whom Winifred was the first; so that the debt which England owed Germany for stocking her with the Anglo-Saxon race was, even at this early period, fully repaid. Then followed the conquests of Charles Martel, when each rude tribe, as it was subjugated, was invited to receive the religion of Rome, so that the sword and the Gospel went hand in hand in Germany, as the sword and the Korán had done previously in Asia, though not exactly in the same sense. The Anglo-Saxon missionaries also collected the people into towns, and introduced the elements of civilisation among them, and they founded those monasteries which became asylums of peace during the violent convulsions that disturbed the country throughout the Middle Ages.

In the eighth century, the Franks, having become a great power under Charlemagne, were able to bring the races of Germany under subjection, the only people who gave them trouble being the Saxon remnants who had not been converted, who were not overcome till after a long and bloody war. The empire of Charlemagne was thus extended from the Ebro to the Elbe, and from the ocean to the Vistula,

the Theiss, and the Save. Intermediately, the Papal See had found means to secure a jurisdiction, both temporal and spiritual, over the defunct empire of the West; and, being sorely troubled by the Lombards, who had established themselves in Italy, Adrian I. applied to Charlemagne for aid against them, upon which Lombardy was conquered and Charlemagne crowned king of Italy. After this, the Pope, to secure continued protection from the conqueror, declared him emperor, reviving the Western empire; and it was agreed between them that the Pontiff should reside at Rome, and the temporal Cæsar beyond the Alps—nearer to the centre of his territories. From this time till the reign of Charles the Simple, the affairs of Germany are interwoven with those of France, and the history of the two countries is necessarily the same. The succession to the empire being destined by Charlemagne for his son, he made him king of Italy to begin with, upon which that appellation became equivalent to the old designation of Cæsar; and, as many emperors contented themselves with the lower title till they were actually crowned at Rome, the inference was established that the sovereign was not qualified to act as emperor till after his consecration by the Pope. Adrian IV., in writing to Frederick Barbarossa on the subject, laid down the premises in the following words: "The Roman empire was translated from the Greeks to the Germans; but the king of the Teutons was not called emperor before he was crowned by the Apostolic power. Before his consecration he was king; after it he became emperor. Of whom, then, but of us, doth he hold the empire? From the election of his own princes he enjoys the name of king; from our consecration he derives the appellation of emperor, Augustus, and Cæsar: therefore through us he governs. . . . Whatever he hath as emperor, he hath from us; for as Zacharias transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, so can we transfer it from the Germans to the Greeks."

The successors of Charlemagne possessed the empire by hereditary right, and exercised full regal powers, as he had

done, throughout the entire extent of their dominions.

But the effeminacy of some of the rulers disgusted the Germans, and when the Normans were bought off by the French, the provocation became insufferable, and the principal nations of Germany—the Franks, Suabians, Bavarians, Saxons, and Thuringians—assembled in full diet and elected a separate emperor for themselves. The crown of Germany was from this time parted for ever from that of France. The French policy of hereditary succession was at the same time overthrown; the dukes, margraves, and counts of the empire, with the archbishops, bishops, and abbots, constituting themselves the legitimate electors of the chief by whom they would be governed. The succession thus became elective, though, as a rule, a member of the reigning house was generally chosen. In time the electors and princes insensibly acquired rights and ruling privileges within their estates, by which the whole country was divided into independent principalities, and this left to the emperors a general supremacy only, which, being indefinite, varied according to the vigour of the arm by which it was swayed.

The first chief selected by the Germans was Arnulf, Duke of Carinthia; but he died shortly after, upon which Conrad was elected, and founded the house of Saxony. The main divisions of German society at this time were four—namely, (1) the slaves, (2) the freedmen, (3) the freemen, and (4) the nobles. The first comprised the captives taken in war, all debtors unable to meet their engagements, and convicted criminals. Several of these were allowed to purchase their emancipation with the produce of their labour, and these were known as freedmen. The warriors were all freemen; and the princes, dukes, and counts they served were the nobles, who held their estates under the feudal system on the obligation of service, with an interminable system of subdivisions under them, by which the number of proprietors was immensely multiplied, and their reciprocal relations made exceedingly complicated. One thing was clearly understood, that every freeman was bound to follow the

banner of his local chief wherever it might lead to, and this necessarily placed a large amount of authority in the hands of the greater chiefs, and made them virtually independent. The bolder warriors were enabled by it to assume extensive powers, and often to commit great crimes, which gave rise to much internal disorder, at the same time that externally the nation was perpetually harassed by the Slavs from one side and the Huns from another.

The first sovereign who consolidated the empire was Henry, surnamed the Fowler, so called from his having been much addicted to the pursuit of birds, in which amusement he was actually engaged when he received the news of his elevation. His success was owing, not only to the prowess of his arms, which was great, but also to his readiness at conciliation, by which he reconciled several of his enemies, including the dukes of Suabia and Bavaria, to his rule. He also induced the duke of Lorraine to join the Germanic confederation, prevailing on Charles the Simple of France to renounce his claims on the province and allow it to secede. He at the same time beat back the Huns, to whom it had hitherto been customary to pay black-mail, which he refused; was the first in Germany to surround open towns and villages with ditches and walls for their protection; established the march of Meissen against the Slavs; and encouraged industry and arts of every description. The reign of his successor, Otho the Great, was equally successful, Italy being reduced by him and added to the empire; while several victories were won over the Slavs, Danes, and Huns, the defeat of the last people enabling him further to consolidate the margravate of Austria. What the reign of Otho was, however, principally famous for, was his quarrel with Pope John, whom he deposed, setting up Leo VIII. in his place, whereby the right of the emperor to nominate the Pope was originated. Even before this time the rival pretensions of the Empire and the Papal See had, from the time of the Carolingians, often disturbed the public tranquillity. It became worse now. The great Charlemagne had received regal consecra-

tion at the hands of the spiritual Cæsar, and the Popes had based on that the principle that the blessing of the Church was necessary to the assumption of the imperial title. A corresponding privilege as regards the election of the Pope came henceforth to be claimed by the emperors, and the quarrels which arose from the arrogation of these different rights were incessant.

The Saxon dynasty ended with the reign of Henry II., who abstained from the bed of his wife, and left no heir. A great part of the time of this prince was taken up by the disturbances created by the dukes and their military dependants the counts and barons, who in Germany very early assumed the character of bandits, and perpetrated acts of violence which even bandits would have blushed at. The reason of this apparently was the rapid deterioration of the national character, which, though still as pugnacious as before, had almost forgotten its original impassioned love of liberty, and now asserted the rights of manhood only by an excess in eating, drinking, and debauchery. Notwithstanding this drawback, however, considerable consolidation was received by the empire during the Saxon period, and several new margravates were added, in the same manner as the Americans add new States to their union. The position of the empire was, by these means, raised in the scale of nations, and even the proud Cæsars of the East were induced to ally themselves by marriage with the Cæsars of the West.

The Franconian dynasty was commenced in 1024, by the election of Conrad II., a nobleman of Franconia, in whose time Burgundy was annexed. The greatest king of the line was Henry IV.; but his reign was rendered unhappy and unprofitable by fresh discords with the Pope. On the one side, the Papal See aspired to a temporal as well as spiritual supremacy over Germany, which Henry would not allow; on the other, the emperor assumed a right of investing bishops with the crosier and the ring in token of their submission to him, which the Pope violently opposed. The emperor deposed the Pope and committed

great disorders in the Pontifical States. The Pope obtained greater advantages by deposing and excommunicating the emperor, which raised his own sons and subjects against him. After a twenty years' war, in which he fought sixty battles, the emperor was barely able to pacify the empire and subdue his eldest son. But the success was momentary, as his second son rebelled immediately after, and wresting the sceptre from him, reduced him to such straits that in his last days he wanted even the necessaries of life. The private life of this emperor was execrable; his licentious amours dishonoured the noblest families; nay, he did not even spare his own, for it is said that he violated his sister, and made his son defile his step-mother's bed. But in all other respects he was a great king, who met the difficulties of his position with singular energy and firmness.

From this time to the reign of Rodolph I. the history of Germany is principally remarkable for a continuous struggle of two centuries between the emperors and the Popes, the papal power having now risen to its greatest height. Henry V. endeavoured to settle all differences forcibly by capturing the Pope; but, after the death of his captive—Pascal—Calixtus II., though a relation of the emperor, pressed on him with greater pertinacity, revived the excommunication against him, and obliged him to effect a compromise, whereby he renounced the right of investing bishops with the emblems of their pastoral duty, the ring and the crosier, and only retained the right of conferring temporalities on them by the emblem of the sceptre. In the reign of Lothario, the Saxon, still farther concessions had to be made, and the emperor gave up his right to be present at ecclesiastical elections, the homage of the bishops to him being changed to a vain oath of fidelity and obedience. In other respects also the power of the empire was at this time much on the decline, particularly on account of the internal feuds of the nobles, who were not only hostile to the sovereign, but always at war with each other. Under the feudal system, as dominant in Germany, military ser-

vice was obligatory on all; but this only qualified the dukes and counts to aspire at independence, the freemen being held bound to follow the banners of their local chiefs, while the local chiefs, intent on mere selfish objects, did not consider themselves equally bound to follow the imperial standard, except for the defence of the country against foreign invaders. This, towards the close of the Franconian period, led to the raising of mercenary troops by the emperors, as they could no longer depend on a feudal army; and, as both the mercenary troops and ducal forces shared in the predatory habits of the German nobles, the whole country was laid under contribution and plundered by them, which there was no power strong enough to prevent.

With the Suabian dynasty originated the terms Guelph and Ghibeline, which subsequently attained so much notoriety in the annals both of Italy and Germany. They were first used in the quarrel that broke out between Conrad III., the founder of the Suabian line, and Henry, duke of Bavaria, who opposed his election, the friends of Henry being called Guelphs after one of his ancestors, while those of Conrad were called Ghibelines, from Wiblung, a town in which his ancestors had resided. The greatest of the Suabian princes was Frederick Barbarossa; and yet he had, on the one hand, to fight on equal terms with one of his own vassals, Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, whose defection compelled him to conclude a disastrous peace in Italy, by which he acknowledged the independence of the free cities of that country; and, on the other, was obliged so far to humiliate himself before the Pope as to hold his stirrup and kiss his feet. The personal vigour of the man, however, neutralized considerably the disadvantages of his position. He swayed the diets as he pleased, and secured great deference from his vassal princes generally, particularly after Henry the Lion was banished and deprived of his estates. This increased the power of his son, Henry the Severe, to such an extent that he was only prevented from making the empire hereditary in his family by the opposition of the Saxons. The last of the line was

Frederick II., whose reign was particularly famous for the continuous struggle with the Holy See, known as the war of the Guelphs and Ghibelines—the latter name being adopted by the adherents of the emperor on account of his being a Suabian, while the former was taken up by the partisans of the Pope merely as a distinguishing and hostile designation. The war both in Italy and Germany assumed a ferocious character. At first the emperor was everywhere successful, till fortune veered towards the close of his career. His defeat at Parma was followed by his death; and the glory of the empire died with him, till it was resuscitated by the house of Austria.

The greatest obstacles to the wellbeing of Germany up to this period were raised by her unfortunate connection with the spiritual Cæsar at Rome. The dual chiefs in Italy and Germany could never agree; the quarrel between them was constant; and, as Germany was at the same time exposed to attacks from the Slavs and Huns, and also suffered from internal disturbances created by her dukes and counts, she had scarcely rest enough to form herself into such a compact empire as she might otherwise have become. The quarrel with the Vatican was a perpetual see-saw. In the reigns of Otho the Great and Henry III. the Pope got worsted, and the Romans were obliged to bind themselves never to choose a Pope without the emperor's consent. The tables were turned in the reign of Henry IV., who was summoned by Hildebrand to appear before him to give an account of his loose life, and actually appeared at the gate of the Vatican barefooted, and stood there for three days, before Hildebrand would give him the absolution he begged for. So, also, had Frederick Barbarossa to hold the stirrup of Alexander III., and even gave offence to that haughty Pontiff from having got hold of the left stirrup, and not the right, for which mistake he was obliged to apologize. This pious insolence was maintained till the papal power began in the fourteenth century to decline; but even so late as Joseph I. (1705-11) we find the Pope able to rise up in arms against the imperial authority, although he was not

able to sustain the opposition long, and was terrified into submission. What gave the popes the advantage was the power of excommunication exercised by them, which enabled them to raise even the subjects of the emperor—nay, even his own children—against him; and, in a country where the nobles were constantly looking out for excuses to embarrass their sovereign, the confusion thus created was necessarily great.

The insecurity caused by these incessant troubles throughout the empire led, in the thirteenth century, the chief cities of the north to form themselves into a confederation, called the Hanseatic league, for the protection and expansion of commerce. The history of this league is singular, and will bear to be repeated. Commerce had been advancing steadily from the eleventh century, but, for the reasons stated, not so satisfactorily as in other countries, the chief drawback felt by the cities of the north being the piracies in the Baltic, which the empire was not able to put down. The cities therefore took the matter into their own hands, and joining together, soon rose to the dignity of a sovereign power. The chief emporiums of their commerce were London, Bergen in Norway, Novogorod in Russia, and Bruges in Flanders, each commanding the market of a wide extent of territory around it, throughout the whole of which the league enjoyed an uncontrolled monopoly with the assistance of the governments concerned, which were largely bribed. It augmented its usefulness by undertaking the opening of mines, encouraging domestic manufactures, and clearing and cultivating forests, which were soon covered with hemp, flax, and corn. It also raised towns in the place of hamlets, gave birth to a wish among the people for the comforts and conveniences of life, and furthered the cause of civilisation and refinement in diverse ways, at the same time that it became strong enough to maintain an offensive war with Denmark, and was courted into alliance by the United Provinces, besides entering into treaties with other kings and states, and notably with the king of France. Eventually, it grew corrupt from its very success.

Being anxious to arrogate the whole trade of the north, it began to exercise that force and rapine which it had originally arisen to suppress. This necessarily created many enemies, who rose up in defence of their respective rights. The increasing civilisation of Europe caused at the same time a diversion in the heart of the union itself. The cities of Holland and Friesland, though belonging to it, were the first to discover that independent action on their part would bring them greater advantages than the confederation was able to secure. They thereupon renounced the union, and the example was followed by other cities in time. In the seventeenth century only three cities kept up the union—namely, Lubeck, Hamburg, and Bremen—but without any particular advantage to themselves.

Another institution which came into prominence at about the same time with the league was the Teutonic order of Knighthood, called into existence by the king of Jerusalem, who, in consideration of the services rendered by the gentlemen-volunteers who accompanied Frederick Barbarossa to the Holy Land, formed them into an order of knighthood on the plan of the Knights Templar and the Knights of St. John. This new institution was confirmed by the Pope, and Henry the Severe bestowed on it rights and lands. Returning from the Holy Land, the knights first took up arms against the Russians and other pagan races of the north, whom they kept at bay. In 1331, they conquered Prussia, or the land originally occupied by the Gothic tribe called Borussi, and at this time inhabited promiscuously by the Teutons, Wends, Letts, and Slavs; and they ruled over it as vassals of the king of Poland. They were, like the other knightly fraternities of the age, monks and crusaders, and bound by the vows of poverty and celibacy. In 1525, Albert, margrave of Brandenburg, grand-master of the order, renouncing the priestly character, married and got children, and his knights following the example established the secular kingdom of Prussia, the grandmaster becoming its first duke. The title of king was obtained later, by Frederick I., from the Emperor

Leopold.* These Teutonic knights were, like the knights of the other orders, very fond of tournaments and martial exercises. In Germany even ecclesiastics engaged in tournaments, which was rarely the case in any other country. But unfortunately, predatory incursions were confounded by the knights of Germany with deeds of valour, and the noblest warriors were not ashamed to indulge in open robbery. The only object held in view by knighthood and chivalry in the country was to foster and preserve the military spirit of the nation, and that object was well-attained. But the knight without reproach and shame was not a German specimen.

A third institution of the feudal times was the *Vehme Gerichte*, or secret tribunals of Germany, which bore for a long time a much-dreaded name. The feuds of the nobles and the lawlessness of the banditti maintained by them having filled the whole country with anarchy and violence, and there being no power in it able to check the reign of misrule and oppression, a little band of courageous and upright men took upon themselves the difficult task of finding an adequate remedy for the evils they laboured under, and with this view set up the secret tribunals, which are said to have existed before in the days of Charlemagne, but which had long fallen into disuse. The courts were unconstitutional, but held their sittings in the open air, and not under ground as the romances describe. Their officers were all initiated, a necessary precaution for secrecy; but they numbered among them some of the greatest chiefs of the land, and several of the emperors. Very great was the good achieved by them, particularly by the protection they afforded to the weak and the innocent. But they were continued too long, after the necessity for their existence had terminated; and, in their later stage, they not only ceased to be useful, but became absolutely injurious to the best interests of society, by contributing to prolong the reign of barbarism: though, taken altogether, it may still be conceded that they did greater good than harm to the poorer classes.

After the Suabian period Germany was for twenty years without a head, the crown not being a coveted prize. A fit successor was at last found in Rodolph of Hapsburg, a Swiss, who commenced his reign by renouncing the supremacy hitherto claimed by the empire over Italy, France, and Catalonia, as having belonged to it from the time of Charlemagne, and sat down to suppress internal disorders, and to establish peace and tranquillity. To this end he destroyed all the fortresses which the nobles had erected for purposes of plunder, and compelled them to submit their differences to arbitration. This revived Germany, which had become an extensive robbers' hold, from desolation; the peasant returned to his plough, and the merchant to occupations which had long ceased to be remunerative. Justly, therefore, was Rodolph held to be the second restorer of the empire—its greatest benefactor since the days of Charlemagne. For all that, he did not the less seek the aggrandizement of his own family; and, the rebellion of Ottocar, king of Bohemia, giving him the disposal of the duchies of Austria, Styria, and Carniola, he bestowed them, with the consent of the diet, on his son, whereby the house of Austria was founded. In the reigns that followed, the hobby of conquering Italy was revived, and the struggles with the Pope were renewed. In the reign of Ludovic IV. the diet took the bold step of publishing the Pragmatic Sanction, which expressly denied the right of the Pope to interfere in the election of emperors; and in that of Charles IV. was promulgated the Golden Bull, so called from the golden seal attached to the document, which fixed the number and defined the prerogatives of the electors. Originally, the election was confined to the five principal nations of Germany—the Franks, Suabians, Bavarians, Saxons, and Thuringians—each of which constituted a duchy. To these the Lorrainers were afterwards added, but they never acquired equal influence with the rest, on account of their fluctuating relations between Germany and France. In later times the number of principalities and seigniories was greatly increased, till the election came to

be made* by all the princes of the empire assembled together, which necessarily gave rise to immense confusion, corruption, and extraneous interference. The electors were therefore now induced to transfer their powers to seven chiefs—a mystic number, selected for representing the seven candlesticks of the Apocalypse, and the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost. Three of these chiefs were ecclesiastics—namely, the bishops of Maintz, Treves, and Cologne; while the other four were secular princes—namely, the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatinate of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. The number was afterwards increased to eight, and eventually to nine. Besides this body, a wider council embraced all the chiefs entitled to sit on the diets or general assemblies with a deliberative and decisive voice, and included all the dukes, margraves, landgraves, burgraves, and counts, together with all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots. To some imperial towns the same privilege was also conceded, with others, such as the regulation of the forms of government within their respective jurisdictions, and the enactment of laws for their own government; but to the people of the country at large no similar concessions were ever made.

On the election of Rodolph the possessions of the house of Hapsburg in Switzerland were united to the empire, and became part and parcel of the dominion of Austria. The Swiss, as ever, were extremely jealous of their liberty, but remained perfectly submissive so long as no attempts were made to reduce them to servitude. Albert I., the son of Rodolph, irritated them by endeavouring to force on them all the claims of an absolute sovereign, which they would not allow; and when the governors appointed by him attempted to domineer over them unduly, they rose up in arms against them, and expelled them. The story of Tell is apocryphal; he would not bow to Geisler's hat, and was compelled to shoot at an apple placed on his son's head. The mark was hit, and Tell liberated; but this act, it is said, aroused the indignation of the men of three cantons

—Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwalden—who contentiously renounced the authority of Austria. The battle of Morgarten, the Marathon of Switzerland, was fought in 1315, and secured the independence of that country. Subsequently, France and Burgundy attempted to coerce her, but without success. The house of Austria sold the greater part of its possessions in Switzerland to the cantons of Zurich and Berne.

In the Germanic empire the house of Austria became dominant by the election of Albert II. to the throne, in 1437; and from that time to 1805, when the constitution of Germany was subverted by Napoleon I., the emperor was always chosen from that line. This preference was secured by the great possessions and power already acquired by the house of Austria, which, by the marriage of Albert with the heiress of Sigismund, had united with itself the thrones of Hungary and Bohemia. Hungary was the country of the Huns, who had constantly been fighting with the Germans, even after they were well-defeated and confined for the time within their own territory by Otho the Great. They continued to be ruled by their own sovereigns till the union of their country with Austria after the death of Sigismund, though a permanent union was not effected till long after, in the reign of Ferdinand I. Bohemia, the country of the Boii, was also subdued by the Emperor Otho, but continued to be ruled over by its own dukes, who were, however, never wholly independent, being generally subject to Poland or Hungary, until the final union of the country with Austria, after the death of Sigismund. The possessions thus acquired by Austria were not very easy burthens, as they always gave her much trouble; but they also gave her a preponderance of power in the empire which was not possessed at this time by any other state. As was mentioned by the Bishop of Maintz at the election of Charles VI., the empire was a wife of high family without fortune, that had to be maintained at great expense, which the powerful house of Austria alone could afford. We read that at one time the empire was

offered to an English sovereign, Edward III., by whom it was judiciously refused.

The reign of Maximilian I. commenced at about the time when the Middle Ages were terminated. Though France and Germany were hostile by their very position, no complications of any magnitude had arisen between them up to this time. The marriage of Maximilian with the daughter of Charles of Burgundy first brought the two countries into direct collision. France seized all the provinces of Charles immediately after his death, excepting the Netherlands, which were acquired by Germany; but Maximilian regarded his son Philip as the rightful heir, not only of the Netherlands, but also of the states which France had annexed. The complication became greater from the subsequent marriage of Philip with the Infanta of Spain, as both France and Spain were contending for the throne of Naples; but Maximilian was not strong enough to oppose the French king effectually, and the fury of the contention was staved off to a later date. In the reign of Maximilian the diet established a perpetual peace in Germany by adopting vigorous measures for the suppression of private warfare, and by providing a paramount court of justice. The empire, hitherto divided into six circles, was now redistributed into ten, by the addition of new circles for Austria, the Netherlands, the Lower Rhine, and Upper Saxony; the public law was also better defined; the administration of justice reformed; and domestic wars between the cities and principalities were put a stop to by the imposition of the severest penalties. Maximilian was the first also to establish a standing army; and he so improved the artillery that he was called its founder.

The greatest sovereign of the house of Austria was Charles V., the son of Philip, who, besides his German possessions, including the Netherlands, was also king of Spain, Naples, Sicily, and the New World, by right of his wife, which made him the most powerful monarch of his day in Europe. His election, as stated in the preceding chapter, was contested by Francis, king of France, whose

defeat made him an enemy, and led to unceasing contests, Charles being at the same time also much troubled on the confines of Hungary by the foe then most dreaded in Europe, the Turks. These difficulties were rendered interminable by the coalition of other states, and by the religious movement which was spreading steadily all over Europe. The age of Charles was the age of the Reformation. The clergy in Germany had long been disliked and hated. They had ample privileges and immunities which they had abused; and, since they were relieved from the depredations of the secular nobles, they had become more rapacious and tyrannical in the enforcement of their ecclesiastical demands. Their lives, moreover, were immoral, their imposture gross, and the sale of indulgences had made them thoroughly despised. The wish for a reformation had thus already arisen; and this not only in Germany, but also in Italy, where the schisms in the popedom had destroyed much of the reverence that had been paid to the Church. The subject had, moreover, been rendered illustrious by the poetry of Dante and Petrarch: the teachings of Luther were therefore warmly received, even from the outset. The same lessons were also taught by Zwingli in Switzerland, and were there equally well received; and they rapidly spread into France, the Low Countries, and England, where the ground had been prepared for their reception by the instructions of Wicliffe and his disciples. Charles detested the new doctrines. They were condemned by a diet assembled by him at Spires, against which decision the Elector of Saxony and other German princes, and the deputies of fourteen cities, protested, whence the name of Protestants was derived. A civil war followed: the emperor was obliged to temporize, for he needed the assistance of all his subjects to get over his frontier difficulties. The liberty of conscience they contended for was therefore allowed; and this enabled him to tide over the imminent danger of the Turkish invasion, which was repelled. After that, diet after diet, and colloquy after colloquy, were held, in the vain hope of bringing back the dissidents to the bosom of

the Church ; and eventually, unable to suppress his real designs any further, Charles attempted to enforce them. In this he was unsuccessful. The Lutheran princes were equal to the occasion, and, with the aid of Francis, were able to maintain their convictions, and secure the religious peace they sought for, Charles being compelled to permit the free exercise of the Protestant religion in the independent cities and principalities of the empire. This produced a revolution, which led to many changes, including a definition of the political constitution of the country. Intellect was also liberated, and religion and morals purified. But the spirit of Charles was embittered by the opposition he received ; and after a vain attempt to elevate his son to the throne, he abdicated it to his brother Ferdinand, who was elected to succeed him.

The Emperor Mathias, who succeeded in 1612, having undertaken to repress the Protestants, gave rise to the Thirty Years' War,—one of the most disastrous that ever afflicted any country, and which shook Europe to its very extremities. The Protestants were assisted by Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, the greatest captain of the age, and the professed enemy of the house of Austria. They were also aided by the kings of Denmark and France. The death of Gustavus at the battle of Lützen cast a temporary gloom over their affairs ; but the Swedish generals who succeeded him ably sustained the glory acquired by their king ; and the French, under Turenne, were equally successful. This led to the peace of Westphalia, by which the Protestants and Catholics were for the first time placed on an equal footing. The limits of the imperial, electoral, aristocratic, and municipal powers were also definitely prescribed, and a stable foundation laid for the international law of Europe. Germany was, by this agreement, dismembered of the Rhine Provinces, which France, in protection of Protestant interests, had occupied and was permitted to retain, gaining thereby a facility of passage both into Germany and Italy ; Sweden obtained a footing on German soil, which gave her the command of the Elbe and

the Oder, and three votes at the diet; Switzerland was admitted to be free; while the different states composing the empire were gratified by a show of independence, which virtually made them weaker, by depriving them of the advantages of concord and union, and led to the smaller states being made dependent on the larger states, and to the subjugation of most of the imperial towns, once the chief seats of German wealth; prosperity, and commerce. From this time may be dated the rapid decline of the empire as a confederate body; which not only disabled Germany from withstanding any of the great powers without, but also made her subject to the domination of the great states within. The original phantom of a Holy Roman empire, with its dual chiefs—spiritual and temporal—was now virtually dissolved; the empire was split up into parts, and those parts began very soon to quarrel among themselves for supremacy over each other; the right of the strongest was everywhere predominant: and everywhere the people were oppressed and ill-treated.

In the reign of Leopold I., Hungary was in rebellion, and the Turks, assisted by the insurgents and encouraged by France, laid siege to Vienna. They were defeated and driven away by Sobieski, king of Poland; after which Leopold was able to reduce Hungary, and then to join the confederacy formed for the purpose of restraining the encroachments of France. Like Francis I., Louis XIV. had also aspired to the imperial throne, which his ministers had claimed on his behalf during his minority, on the death of Ferdinand III. Not succeeding in obtaining it, Louis indulged, throughout the whole of his reign, in a series of the most unprovoked, wanton, and unprincipled aggressions on Germany, till a sense of common danger aroused other countries—Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and England—to combine against him, he being eventually humbled by the successes of Marlborough. Germany was generally the scene of action, and suffered considerably on that account; but what it suffered more from was the constant endeavours which were now made by the emperors to extend

the prerogatives of the Crown. Ever since the peace of Westphalia the house of Austria had always exhibited an eager desire to extinguish the liberties of the empire, and make the imperial crown hereditary in itself; and the disturbances created by Louis XIV. were so far beneficial to Germany that they prevented the emperors from completing the mischief they designed.

In 1741, Maria Theresa, the daughter of Charles VI., succeeded to the possessions of the house of Austria, under the terms of an edict previously passed by the diet at the instance of her father, which most of the powers of Europe had promised to defend. Many of those powers, however, when the occasion arose, thought it particularly favourable for dismembering Austria of her vast possessions. The king of Prussia demanded Silesia; the king of Poland, Austria; the Elector of Bavaria, Bohemia; and the king of Sardinia, Milan. The crisis was hurried by the Elector of Bavaria, who, entering Upper Austria, took Linz, and menaced Vienna. The terrified queen fled thereupon to Hungary, with her infant in her arms, and all Hungary rose up to a man to defend her cause. The grateful tears of Maria increased the enthusiasm of the Hungarians, and made them invincible; she received some assistance also from England: and the chivalrous bandits, who had expected to divide her dominions among themselves, were first astonished at the opposition improvised, and then content to draw back, which led to the husband of Maria being elected emperor of Germany.

The great disturber of the peace of Europe at this period was Frederick II., the king of Prussia, well-known as Frederick the Great. The secular kingdom of Prussia having been established by Albert of Brandenburg, the Prussians joined the Protestant cause, and began to develop themselves, intellectually and materially, as that cause was expanded. The temporal Cæsar opposed this more vigorously than the spiritual Cæsar; hard blows were exchanged; but the final result was the acquisition of more and more of German soil by the new state. In the reign

of Leopold I. Prussia was raised to the dignity of a kingdom, the emperor having found a cordial supporter of his power in Frederick I. The second king, Frederick William I., amassed a considerable treasure, and formed an army of sixty thousand men; and these resources enabled his successor, Frederick II., considerably to enlarge his dominions. From the queen of Hungary he obtained Silesia and Glatz; but what he gained most from was the partition of Poland, of which he was the most active agent, and which was effected in concert with Russia and Austria, at a time when Poland was torn by intestine feuds and sunk in anarchy. Up to this time the Poles had done faithful service in Europe. As the French withstood the encroachments of Mahomedanism from the south, so did the Austrians and the Poles repel its encroachments from the east, after the reduction of the Eastern empire by the Turks. But unfortunately, since 1542, the kingly office in Poland had been made elective, which gave rise to violent factions in the state, and compelled appeals to foreign powers, that excited their cupidity. A disputed election at last became the pretext for the three great neighbouring sovereigns to interfere, and they decided amongst themselves that the best remedy for the distemper which caused so much uneasiness was to appropriate the kingdom to themselves, which Europe permitted without demur. The partition designed in 1772 was not completed till 1795. Frederick II. died intermediately, in 1786, after having added a population of two millions to his paternal inheritance, doubled the revenue of his country, and formed an army of two hundred-thousand men—the best-disciplined force in Europe. The power thus consolidated acted from this time as a counterpoise to the house of Austria in the affairs of Germany, which materially altered her position.

The wars of the French Revolution were commenced in 1792, as the inevitable sequel of the partition of Poland, which had compelled the Prussian and Austrian forces to remain inactive when their joint action in the Netherlands would have nipped the revolutionary movement in the bud.

The emperor of Germany had a personal interest in the contest that broke out, as being the brother of the unfortunate Marie Antoinette who was guillotined, and the conflicts in Germany were necessarily numerous. These were ended for a time by the peace of Campo Formio, by which Austria was obliged to cede Italy and the Netherlands; but hostilities were soon after renewed under Napoleon I., and Vienna being taken and occupied, the German constitution was, by the treaty of Presburg (1805), subverted, the emperor becoming emperor of Austria only, and not of Germany, while the other German states were formed into a separate association called the Confederation of the Rhine, of which Bonaparte declared himself to be the Protector.

The triumphs of Bonaparte being abruptly terminated, the Confederation of the Rhine was, in 1815, replaced by an independent confederation, a permanent diet of plenipotentiaries from the states retaining sovereign power being established at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. The states represented were thirty-one in number; but as some of the smaller ones voted jointly with others, the total number of representatives was seventeen—namely, from (1) Austria; (2) Prussia; (3) Bavaria; (4) Saxony; (5) Hanover; (6) Wurtemberg; (7) Baden; (8) the Electorate of Hesse; (9) Grand Ducal Hesse; (10) Denmark, for Holstein and Lauenburg; (11) the Netherlands, for Limburg and Luxemburg; (12) Saxe Meiningen, Saxe Coburg Gotha, and Saxe Altenburg; (13) Brunswick and Nassau; (14) the two Mecklenburgs; (15) the two Schwarzburgs; (16) Lichtenstein, Reuss, Schaumburg Lippe, Lippe Detmold, and Hesse Homburg; and (17) the free cities of Frankfort, Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburg. In theory the votes were equal, and the jurisdiction of the diet extensive; but, as the greater powers jealously guarded their exclusive rights, the actual character of the diet was rather that of a court of registration than of an independent body exercising sovereign powers. For the preservation of internal tranquillity the diet had extensive authority, but that

authority was effectual only when enforced against secondary states. As a league for enforcing respect from other nations, the confederation had a large army, but not the necessary unity for effective action; and generally, in all matters internal and external, its proceedings were marked with activity only when the great powers—Austria and Prussia—were agreed.

Unfortunately, that agreement was very rare. The precedence of Austria had been acquired with the assent of the confederated states, and under the sanction of all the great powers at the Congress of Vienna, by which the public law of Europe was re-established. But Prussia was not reconciled to it; her geographical position made her interests identical with those of the other German states; the interests of Austria were not the same with them to the same extent. It was determined, therefore, by Prussia to throw Austria overboard, exclude her from taking part in German affairs, and remodel the confederation, so as to leave the control of the armed force of Germany entirely in Prussia's hands. Nothing short of this would have given Prussia the lead; and she was determined to be satisfied with nothing less. All the measures taken by Prussia for the attainment of this purpose will not bear examination; but the end held in view was accomplished. Ever since Jena and Wagram the necessity for a united Germany had been fully established. All the arrangements made since then had also established that it was not possible for Prussia and Austria to pull together in one direction. The first position conceded to Austria she was unable to justify; the Germanic leaven in her was too weak to enable her to accomplish the needful union; she had neither the military, nor the political, nor the moral strength required for it. Prussia felt that it was now her turn to try; and, as the thing had to be done, she cut off Austria summarily as an unnecessary excrescence, and became herself the nucleus of that united Germany which was wanted.

The federal execution in Holstein was undertaken in

deference to the public opinion of Germany, to redress German wrongs, and only proposed to maintain the rights of Germany in the duchies. But the territorial acquisition secured on that plea was for Prussian aggrandizement alone, and Austria was made to aid in gaining it only with a view to divide the odium of the robbery. That done, the pretext for quarrel between the two rival powers was not long to find, and the good fight was fought, and Austria victimized. By the treaty of Prague (1866) the dissolution of the German confederation was completed and recognised, and Austria engaged to abstain from interference in the reconstruction of Germany, which was effected in the way Prussia wanted. The Elbe duchies were appropriated by Prussia, and a good many of the hitherto independent states were absorbed; while all the states left intact were made to acknowledge her supremacy. This freed Austria of all her German ties, and ought to enable her to consolidate her yet extensive dominions. We have not noticed the insurrections in Austria and Hungary in 1848 and 1849, which were only put down with the assistance of the Russians. The rule of Austria does not rest on a basis of common nationality, and political commotions of the sort were inevitable under the system of absolutism and centralization which Austria had hitherto maintained. Great efforts have since been made to re-erect the edifice, and considerable concessions have been granted to the Hungarians, Croatians, Bohemians, and Poles. But the only foundation on which a confederated constitution would stand perfectly safe—namely, the concession of equal rights and privileges to all parties—remains yet to be tried.

The war of Prussia with Austria settled the nucleus of the German nation; a war with France was necessary to seal its federation. Prussia had armed herself for this; but it would not be true to say that she forced the war on France, though there is no doubt that she tried very hard subsequently to get up a second war. The inconsiderate levity of France hurried on the first war, which she ought

to have carefully guarded against; and, after having defeated two Cæsars, Prussia took up the imperial crown and put it on. This crown is no longer dual: with Austria it has no further concern; still less with the Vatican, though the Pope still affects to claim his original jurisdiction over the Western empire. He continues to interfere with the administration of the country, so far as Catholicism is concerned, for he does not know, he says, when his right to do so ceased. The answer is, that Germany, as now constituted, is not what Germany was in the past. It is a united Germany now in every sense of the word, recognising no ruler out of Germany, no alien jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, over any spot of German land. Germany now is secular only, national, and independent.

But will this unity last? The emperor of Austria is not reconciled to it; the French nation do not admit the contest with them to have finally terminated; and Prussia herself seems to think that her only protection lies in the military system she has inaugurated—a system which holds out a dangerous precedent to Europe, but which has virtually existed in Prussia from the time of Frederick the Great. By it every man in the country is a soldier, its entire male population being bound to personal military service. But can an army thus raised, which must be irresistible for purposes of national defence, be maintained at all times without telling injuriously on the people? The answer is not a difficult one to find; it has, in fact, been given, since no nation in Europe has yet ventured to adopt the system in its integrity. The cost of personal freedom and individual independence involved in it, would deteriorate the best and most flourishing nation in the world; it has deteriorated Prussia so far that she has not grown to the extent she might have done. Even France has colonies, but Prussia has none. It is certain that civilisation in Germany has been thrown back by it, and so hopelessly as to have no chance of reviving in a short time; and if Germany can afford that, it is only because her population at this moment—of Prussia particularly—is more highly

educated than that of any other country in Europe. But, even with that advantage, Germany will not, and cannot, long get on successfully with the clog she has placed upon herself. Providence did not mean men to be soldiers only; the human race has a higher destiny; and it requires no prophet to foretell that her military organization will be Germany's ruin.

Throughout Germany the belief is universal that there will be another war; and that before peace is assured France must be ground again—finer than before. This Prussia is doubtless able to achieve under the system she has chosen, since no country in the world can bring such a mass of soldiers on the field at once, in case of war, as she can. Her army will never fight at a distance; but with her next-door neighbour it must be absolutely irresistible. France, on her part, doubtless nourishes a desire of vengeance; she did so against England after the battle of Waterloo. But, as then, she is not now, and for a long time to come will not be by herself, able to give effect to her wishes. Besides, Germany has been wise in her generation. She has rectified her frontier by resuming territories—Alsace and Lorraine—which belonged to her of old and were forcibly taken away from her by Louis XIV., and these, properly guarded, will not leave the egress from France so easy as it was in the past. All the hopes of France of vengeance must depend, therefore, on a coalition with other powers—with Austria, England, and Russia. England is too wise to intermeddle in matters that do not concern her personally, and is not likely besides to do so against Germany, since in the whole history of Europe they have never been at war with each other. Russia, also, will not intermeddle, because her hands are full with her own affairs. Austria, without the conjunction of England or Russia, will never come out. It will be a long time, therefore, before France is able to secure that co-operation without which she can have no chance of success. Why, then, should Germany continue to be so strongly armed, and by her attitude force her neighbours to maintain

ruinous forces? The game is a dangerous one even for her to play at, and is pressing very hard on the Prussian people. Empires based on military glory are already subject to suicidal tendencies, and destroy themselves; and Socialism has developed itself in Germany unduly already.

The early history of Germany is simply the history of a few great figures—known as emperors and popes, dukes, margraves, and counts; very little being known of the people beyond this, that they ate, drank, married, settled, fought, and died, as large masses of human beings are doing at this moment of whom history will say nothing in the future. At the outset the freemen would not even acknowledge kings; but, under the names of counts and dukes, the right of governing them was soon acquired, and very soon abused. At no period and under no dynasty were they admitted to a share in the administration, except in the case of the independent cities, which, banding together, formed themselves into a power that forced respect. The general feature of the administration all over the country was an aristocratic rule—a rule of robbers who partitioned the empire among themselves, exercising their sway under the nominal supremacy of a chief whom they set up, but who in rare instances only was able to control their movements successfully. Constant wars kept these unruly spirits perpetually engaged. The Hungarians, Bohemians, Poles, and Turks gave them ample work without; and, when not so engaged, they were always fighting with each other within. The character of a fighting race was thus ever retained.

The temporal Cæsar, as emperor of the West, had an indirect jurisdiction over all the outside kingdoms of the Christian commonwealth; but this, of course, was an authority that could not, and was not attempted to be exercised. He reigned with vigour who was able to control his own diet and check the perpetual disorders created by his own nobles. As in France at the outset, so in Germany almost at all times, the kingdom was only an aggregation of petty sovereignties—not a homogeneous whole—of which

the real rulers were the dukes and counts, while every gentleman who held a fief or knightly tenure under them arrogated a legal right to pillage, which neither serf nor sovereign was able to resist. The aristocracy of the country was of two kinds—one immediately subject to the jurisdiction of the empire, the other subject also to the jurisdiction of the immediate ruler of the principality or dukedom to which the noblemen belonged. A united aristocracy was never known; the subordinate chiefs of distinct states, when in an unreasonable temper, scarcely submitted to imperial control; and many were the emperors who were obliged to rule even over their vassals and sub-vassals by conciliation, wholly unaccompanied by force.

Another great power in the state was the clergy, ostensibly representing the spiritual Cæsar, but oftener arrayed against him than on his side. Barring the opposition they received from the secular nobles, these also had their own way in everything. They were represented in the diet, and that gave them a consequence which was abused. The spiritual labour devolving on them was perfunctorily performed, though no country was plunged in greater darkness than Germany, or stood in greater need of the self-denying and magnanimous virtues to civilise her. They liked the good things of the earth better than the saving of souls, and their demands on the people were not less rapacious than those of the nobles, whereby the reign of anarchy, confusion, and ignorance was prolonged. The disputes between them and the people were constant and interminable; and their profligacy of life led to that early call for a reformation which, in the case of the Hussites, united the two questions of religious abuses and serfdom, and had to be put down by a combination of spiritual and secular arms.

All the progress that Germany has since made has been effected after the days of the Reformation, and mainly under the direction of Prussia. The foundations of liberal studies were, it is true, laid in the schools attached to the cathedrals and monasteries established by the Anglo-Saxon missionaries at the outset; but the studies there prosecuted

rarely included anything beyond the elements of theology, history, and the canon law, with a moderate share of arithmetic, geometry, and natural philosophy, even these being confined within the limits of the cloisters. Greater proficiency was attained by the clergy in the art of magic—especially in the thirteenth century, when the rage for magic was at its height. It was reserved for Prussia, after she became a great state, to free letters and science from spiritual censorship, and incite them to exert their own strength; after which the German mind was soon found to be as well fitted as any other for scientific and philosophical studies, which from the outset had been carefully eschewed. The progress since made in the sciences and arts has been very great: in philosophy the reputation gained by the German is second to none; he has also made many ingenious improvements in mechanics. The country that has produced Klopstock, Kant, Herder, Humboldt, Lessing, Hegel, Goethe, and Schiller, has well vindicated her position in the foremost rank of education and intelligence. But in manufactures and commerce her progress has not been equally great, nor will it be so till her political system is amended. In manufactures especially, Germany stood foremost before the Thirty Years' War, which dispersed her citizens all over Europe. The restoration to that pre-eminence ought to be a higher object to her than the armed superiority now so ardently wished for. Referring to her own history, we find that in the wars with Napoleon I. the Germans suffered so long only as the people would not fight with a heart for a mere choice of despots, but that the tables were turned in 1813, when the youth of Germany burned with patriotic ardour to earn liberal institutions for their country by the expulsion of the French. The same aspiration for liberal institutions is exhibiting itself again, and no attitude which is not favourable to it will endure. At present the government is very strong—stronger than the people. This feature must be altered, or very much modified. As the people get stronger—stronger than the

government set over them—will the commercial and industrial spirit of the nation be developed. The constitution of the country must also be reorganized. The farce of popular representation and self-government exists; but the Reichstag, as now constituted, will never meet the requirements of the age, and the requirements of Germany will soon make themselves to be understood.

CHAPTER VII.

RUSSIA.

RUSSIA has been correctly designated an anomalous member of the European confederacy, being quite as irregular in her constituency, in comparison with other states, as Turkey herself. The fact is, she is an Asiatic power, recently, and almost forcibly, Europeanized, and has not yet fully benefited by the metamorphosis. With one foot in Europe and the other in Asia, she partakes of the character of both continents, and the incongruities arising therefrom have not yet been sufficiently harmonized to be imperceptible. The barbarism of her people is as remarkable as the immensity of her dominion, and these two traits together impart to her features a savage majesty special to herself. At first sight she appears to be more rich and more powerful than all the sister-states whose acquaintance she has forcibly cultivated. But on more intimate acquaintance with her she betrays greater deficiencies than any of them, and the marks of her fragility become palpable in the very vastness of her territory. No empire can be more subject to the caprices of fortune than hers is. To-day it extends from the Baltic to the Pacific, from the Frozen Ocean to Tartary and the Crimea: but there is nothing to prevent its splitting up to-morrow into as many subdivisions as there are nations in it differing from each other in habits, manners, and language; and this will inevitably happen when all those nations are sufficiently educated to be able to understand their rights. The past history of this vast empire is very sad and gloomy; its present history is scarcely much brighter; and it seems that to retain its integrity it is essential that it should also retain its sadness, gloom, and barbarism. No page in the annals of Russia exhibits any-

thing that is bright, heroic, or ennobling, except that which records the recent liberation of the serfs. To what that may eventually lead is yet very uncertain.

The most anciently known inhabitants of Russia were the Scythians in the south, the Slavs in the centre, and the Finns in the north. Of their earliest source no traditions exist. It is believed that the inundations from Central Asia were constant; but they do not appear to have ever penetrated in a northern direction beyond Kief, which was built by the Slavs of the Danube on their being beaten back by the Bulgars. A Slav colony also founded the city of Novogorod further to the north. But beyond that, the attacks and alliances were always from and with the nations of the West—namely, the Varangians, Northmen, or Scandinavians, those hardy pirates who by their persistence and valour overturned such a large portion of Europe. The government of Russia was at this time a republic, which was not wanting in strength; its headquarters being at Novogorod, which was so formidable to its neighbours that it was a common saying among them—"Who can dare to attack God, or Novogorod the Great!" This power implies conquest; and it is known that all the nations from Lithuania to the Oural mountains, and from the Rostaf to the White Sea, were governed by the Novogorodians as tributaries. Their commerce, also, was large, extending to Constantinople in one direction, and Persia and India in another.

The trade through the Baltic having been molested by the Varangians, hostilities broke out between them and the Novogorodians, in which the latter were worsted. The enfeeblement of the state followed; and, becoming unable to retain their independence, the Novogorodians invited the Varangians to come and fight their battles for them. It is the old story of Hengist and Horsa again. The invitation was accepted by three brothers, of whom Rurik was the eldest. Having established themselves in Novogorod as auxiliaries, they were not slow in making themselves masters of it. The republic was overturned in 862, and a

grand-principality established, of which Rurik was the chief. Shortly afterwards, Oskold and Dir, two other Varangian chiefs, founded a separate principality in Kief; and, in the tenth century, one Regnvold held distinct sway at Polotsk. The original republic was thus in all directions completely overturned.

The dominion founded by Rurik was rapidly and prodigiously enlarged by his successor Oleg, who acted as regent during the minority of Rurik's son, Igor, and who by craft and perfidy acquired the possession of Kief, to which the seat of the grand-principality was removed. Acting from this base, Oleg was able to secure a large part of the territory now known as European Russia; and, not content therewith, he descended the Dnieper, at the head of eighty thousand men, devastating the Greek empire even to the walls of Constantinople, to which Oleg was as formidable in his day as any of his successors has ever been. His warriors returned to their country laden with gold, rich stuffs, and wines; and, buying peace on such terms, the Greeks held out a tempting bait to the barbarians, which induced them to repeat their attacks on the empire frequently. The tact of Oleg was displayed in securing the goodwill of the tribes and races he vanquished; and this enabled him to collect under his banners vast hordes of different races, which made his arms irresistible.

The death of Oleg restored Igor to the principality founded by his father; but he had to encounter on his accession an insurrection of the peoples recently conquered by Oleg, of whom one, the Petchenegs, gave him much trouble. The revolt was eventually put down, after which Igor devastated Paphlagonia, Pontus, and Bithynia, and then turned his arms against the Drevalians, by whom he and his companions were massacred. This reverse was fully avenged by his wife Olga, who acted as regent during the minority of her son Sviatoslaf, and who laid the country of the Drevalians waste with an atrocity instances similar to which are only to be found in Russian history. She then went to Constantinople to be baptized! being the

first Christian in Russia who exercised sovereign power. Her government is well-spoken of; she divided Russia into administrative districts; and the kindness of her rule filled the hearts of her people with affection and respect, by which means she obtained the name of St. Olga after death. It is said that her conversion and visit to the capital of the Greek empire were prompted by a desire to consolidate commercial relations with the countries of the south; so that, male or female, the sovereigns of Russia have always had an eye on the tempting wealth of Turkey, and the commercial and political ascendancy to be gained by dealing with her.

Sviateslaf, the son of Igor, was regarded as the Achilles of his age; a rough and impetuous soldier, who rejected the pious exhortations of his mother that he should become a Christian, by the characteristic question whether she wished him to be a laughing-stock to his friends. His life was simple as that of a Tartar. He had no other habitation than the camp, lay on the bare ground or on a piece of coarse felt—the saddle of his horse serving for a pillow, and fed on the flesh of horses. His troops, devoted to him, were similarly inured, and he was thereby enabled to carry war to great distances without embarrassment. He conquered all the country between the Tanais and the Borysthenes, the Chersonesus Taurica and Hungary. As distinguished from the treachery of the times and the people he reigned over, he never attacked his enemies without a previous declaration of war. The greatest defeat he sustained was from the Greeks, by whom he was expelled from Bulgaria; and, the Petchenegs falling on him in his retreat, he and his small band were killed, his skull, surmounted by a golden circlet, being used as a drinking-cup by the chief by whom he was slain. It was in the reign of Sviatoslaf that territories began to be given away in Russia as private appanages to princes of the blood—a pernicious custom, which in a short time broke up the principality into a lot of little states, and weakened the unity of the Russian power.

The first sovereign of the empire who adopted and solidly established Christianity in Russia was Vladimir the Great, who also became a saint. He had six wives and eight hundred concubines, and his character was so infamous that no maid or matron of any attraction who came to his notice was safe from his lust. The prowess of his arm was also great, and he forced back to obedience all the tributary nations that had revolted after the death of Sviatoslaf, at the same time that he brought other nations under his yoke. The power and fame of the man induced four religions to contend for his conversion—namely, Mahomedanism, Judaism, Catholicism, and the Greek Church. The example of his ancestress, Olga, led him to prefer the last; but before receiving the rite of baptism he made a preparatory raid on Greece, the rite being concluded by a new marriage, with Anna, the sister of the Greek sovereign, on which the conquests made by Vladimir were restored. After this, all the idols of Russia were thrown into the Dnieper; but beyond that there was no religious persecution, and the wish for conversion among the Russians was spontaneous. The people were in too low a state of civilisation to care for any religion much; they had no objection to any form of worship that pleased their sovereign; and, when a proclamation was issued asking the inhabitants of Kief to repair to the banks of the river to be baptized, the order was promptly and joyfully obeyed.

The first legislator of Russia was Yaroslaf, a son of Vladimir, who commenced by revolting against his father, and finished by conquering his brothers, after which he became a zealous promoter of Christianity. He was the first to disseminate instruction and civilisation broadcast throughout his dominions, to establish schools, and to wage a continuous war against sorcery and superstition. He also had the Bible translated into Slavonian—a vast undertaking for the age; and he gave Russia a code of laws for which he was principally famous, though all he did was confined to the collection, collation, and registration of the laws and customs which already existed and were sanctioned by

time, removing or disentangling therefrom the complications that had crept in. Unfortunately, he continued the practice of dismembering the empire by parcelling it out among the princes of the blood. The defect in the primitive constitution was thus in a manner legally perpetuated, which at a later date so weakened Russia as to make her an easy prey to the Tartars. Yaroslaf was nevertheless one of the greatest princes of his dynasty; and to him and Vladimir belongs the credit of having made Russia European, as well by their conquests towards the west, the religion they introduced in it, the efforts they made to civilise the people, and their alliances. The daughters-in-law of Yaroslaf were Greek, German, and English princesses; his sister was queen of Poland; his daughters were queens of Norway, Hungary, and France.

The whole authentic history of Russia embraces a period of only a little above one thousand years, which is divided into five great epochs, the first extending from 862 to 1054, which was the period of establishment and consolidation; the second extending from 1055 to 1237, which comprised the period of dissensions and anarchy; the third, from 1238 to 1461, which is known as the period of complete slavery; the fourth, extending from 1462 to 1612, generally recognised as the period of deliverance and despotism; and the last, from 1613 up to the present time, which may be called the period of European civilisation. A minute examination of all these epochs is not necessary. The first period was one of progress. The soldier-kings who commenced it exhibited, in spite of their ferocity and barbarism, traits of greatness deserving attention. A paramount throne, a religion, a code of laws, were all established by them. But the second period was one of relapse, characterized mainly by an unparalleled amount of languor and weakness, diversified at times by bloody struggles and horrible catastrophes, a very general allusion to which will be sufficient. The civilisation that Russia had attained was surrounded on all sides by the densest barbarism. The civil commotions that followed the absence of the genius and

spirit of the first rulers weakened the garrison within, at the same time that it strengthened the enemy without. The outer barbarism, therefore, was shortly triumphant. Kief, softened by the manners of Byzantium, ceased to instruct; the influence and energy of Central Russia, still pagan and barbarous, was renewed. The civil wars were accompanied by innumerable assassinations; and the confusion was augmented by the attacks of the Poles, Hungarians, and Tartars.

The only princes of note during the second period were Vladimir Monomachus and Andrew. The first distinguished himself in distant campaigns, mainly undertaken for the redress of injuries; and yet more by his endeavours to secure the peace of the country, and by the succour he gave to the weak against the oppressions of the strong. The second, Andrew, was artful and politic, and is best known for having removed his seat of government to Vladimir, to withdraw it from the attacks of the Poles and the nomad tribes bordering on Kief. He also aggrandized Moscow, and drew into Central Russia, by the attractions of peace, all the population of the south, who were worried by the disturbances that raged around them. The other princes of the period were only unfortunate burdens on the country, which they did their best to distract with all the horrors of rivalry and war, till, towards the middle of the twelfth century, the grand-principality was reduced to little more than the capital and its immediate surroundings, and the paramount sovereignty to a vain title which was neither respected nor feared.

These intestine divisions led to the subjugation of Russia in the third period, which was the era of Chingez Khán, who united the Moguls and Tartars under him, and extended his barbaric dominion in every direction. After having conquered all Asia, he turned his eyes towards Europe; and, the plan sketched out by him being adhered to by his successors, they penetrated westward as far as Hungary and Poland, whence, being disgusted by the poverty of the inhabitants, they turned back upon Russia,

where they destroyed everything before them, ravaging what they did not conquer, and collecting tribute and slaves. The southern part of Russia was conquered in 1224, but the subjection of the whole country was not completed till 1237-40, by Bâtou Khán, a grandson of Chingez. The Tartars did not settle in Russia; the Khán of the Golden Horde only had his headquarters in it, but his people wandered about as nomads, and the princes of Russia were not unthroned. They were allowed to reign, paying tribute; and no prince, from the time of Yaroslaf II. to that of Ivan III., dared to arrogate regal powers without having first paid homage to the Khán as his suzerain. It is said that they took the oath of fidelity on their knees, and in terms of abject servility; and this degradation was continued for more than two centuries—namely, from the commencement of the thirteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century. Occasionally, when the Tartars were caught nodding, revolts against them were attempted; but the Golden Horde was always strong enough to suppress them; and on one occasion Russia was saved from absolute destruction only by the intercession of Alexander, prince of Novogorod, whom the Tartars regarded with affection and respect. This prince also did service to his country by defeating the Teutonic knights of Prussia on their endeavouring to strip Russia even of what the Tartars had spared; and the battle having been gained on the banks of the Neva, he obtained the name of Nevski from the success of his arms. Another grand-prince whom the Tartars respected was Ivan I., surnamed Kalita, who was able with their assistance to reunite the appanages of the grand-principality, after which he removed the seat of government to Moscow, the position of which, being central, was considered to be best suited for reuniting the whole empire; and this enabled the grand-prince to re-establish order and justice, encourage commerce, open out marts and fairs, and concentrate the sovereign power, which necessarily undermined the supremacy of his suzerain.

The first to refuse tribute to the Golden Horde was Dimitri, whose contumacy gave rise to reciprocal incursions into the territories of each other by the Russians and the Tartars. Finally, the latter, advancing against the grand-prince in large numbers, were met by him and defeated on the banks of the Don, for which victory he received the surname of Donski. But new Tartar hordes were not slow in making their appearance; and Dimitri, abandoned by his brother-princes, was unable to withstand them, the consequence of which was, that Moscow was devastated, the country around it ravaged, and the inhabitants massacred. In the reign of Vassili II., a fresh descent on Moscow was threatened by a different devastator, Timour, who had intermediately destroyed the empire of the descendants of Chingez. But his thoughts soon after took a different direction, though not till the Golden Horde, which had hitherto exacted tribute from the Russians, had received from him a severe blow from which it never rallied. The struggles between the grand-princes and Tartars henceforth became more frequent, and the tributes imposed by the latter were paid or refused as the Kháns happened to be strong or imbecile. The amounts of the tributes paid were also regulated by the same test; and if Vassili III., driven from his throne by a more fortunate competitor, went to implore the protection of the Tartar chief, it was only because he did not know where else to seek for aid.

Of the fourth epoch the greatest sovereign was Ivan III., called Ivan the Great, who had both intelligence and vigour to profit by the movement which had set in for reuniting the dismembered principality, with a view to re-establish one single and despotic throne. To this end he devoted his entire energies; and, the Tartars having already become enfeebled by intestine divisions, he commenced by proceeding against them, which he knew would help him best in carrying out internal reforms. He accordingly undertook an exterminating war against them, refused to pay tribute to the Golden Horde, and eventually

succeeded in destroying it with atrocities peculiar to the age. The Nagais, another branch of the race, but enemies of the Golden Horde, completed the extermination of those whom the Russians had spared; and thus was Russia liberated. After this, Ivan found it comparatively easy to reduce the independent princes who shared amongst them the heritage of Rurik; defeated the Poles in one direction and the Teutonic knights in another; and became sole and absolute master of all Russia, into which he imported the civilisation of the south. He brought over arts and artists from Italy, and all the knowledge of the Greeks; raised the Kremlin with the aid of engineers secured from Germany; had cannons cast and placed over it; and procured the services of foreign miners to work the mines of Petchora, which were discovered during his reign, which enabled him to coin money both in silver and copper. The weight of Russia was by these means brought to bear on the balance of Europe, and the administration of the country was at the same time improved by a reorganization of the clerical order, whose manners were reformed, and by the enactment of a new code of laws which kept pace with the general improvement of the country.

The complete restoration of the principality was achieved by Ivan IV., the Terrible, known in history as the first Czar, though that title had been conferred previously by the Greek emperor on the son of Yaroslaf I., and again on Ivan III. on his marriage with the Greek princess Sophia. The word has been supposed by many to be a corruption of the title Cæsar, but this is erroneous. It is an old oriental word signifying supreme authority; and as the authority of the grand-duke—a title which Ivan III. had assumed in preference to that of grand-prince—had become supreme from the time of Ivan IV., he was justly entitled to the name he adopted. He concentrated his power more fully even than his immediate predecessors had done; established a standing army which went by the name of the Strelitz, or imperial guards; compelled the nobles to accept service, the richest at their own cost, and the rest on small pay,

these constituting the best strength of his empire; but left the cultivators, inhabitants of towns, and especially traders, free to follow their own occupations, except in times of imminent danger, when they too had to bear arms. He, at the same time, improved the civil organization of the empire, encouraged, like Ivan III., the importation of foreign industry, opened the first printing-office in Moscow, rearranged the laws, negotiated treaties of commerce with the nations of the West, and established a market at Narva, to which the English, French, Dutch, and Lubeckers resorted. He also subdued the Tartars of Kasan and Astrakhán; but was, on the other hand, obliged to abandon Esthonia and Revel to the Swedes, and Livonia to the Poles. What Ivan's reign was, however, best known for, were his cruelties, which were frightful. The number of men and women destroyed by him cannot be counted. The people of Novogorod having ventured to revolt, were mercilessly killed, the massacre being continued for five weeks; the inhabitants of Pleskop and Twer, who were accused of secret intelligence with Poland, were first tortured and then decapitated, while eight hundred of their women were drowned. Every day the Czar invented new modes of punishment: he let loose bears from his menageries whenever he saw crowds, and amused himself by listening to the cries of those who were attacked and torn to pieces; stripped women naked and had them dishonoured before he allowed their sufferings to terminate; compelled people to become parricides and fratricides, and then punished them for the crimes they were forced to perpetrate; and yet, in the midst of so many murders and so many victims, there was not one hand raised to oppose his power. In his reign Siberia was conquered by Jermak Timofief, a hetman, or chief, of the Cossacks of the Don, who was loaded with honours and favour, not so much for his conquest as for the carnage and ferocity by which it was characterized.

At the end of the fourth epoch Boris Godunof, the descendant of a Tartar, and the brother of the wife of Ivan IV., became king, by the murder of an infant prince

named Dimitri, with whom the race of Rurik was terminated. Having cleared the way for himself, Godunof pretended that he had no desire to ascend the throne. He even affected to fly from it, and sought refuge in a monastery, where the grandees and the people besieged him with supplications which he continued to resist. The sceptre was at last forced on him; two public elections mastered his aversion for grandeur, and the imperial power was assumed under the guise of the purest virtue and the noblest disinterestedness. He then completed the scheme which Ivan III. and Ivan IV. had chalked out, stifled the power of the nobles, and reduced the whole nation to an order of slaves. No free intercourse, no public meeting, no travelling through the country, no public minstrelsy even, was permitted during his reign without imperial licence; serfdom of the soil was firmly established; and, if the peasants fled in large numbers to seek freedom among the Cossacks, in still larger numbers they submitted to the life that was marked out for them. Godunof was not prodigal in crime, though he did not spare it. What he did, however, was done privately; and his reign would have passed off quietly but for the appearance of two impostors, one after another, who personated the prince Dimitri who had been murdered, and who, with the assistance of the Poles, gave rise to a revolt. At this crisis Godunof died, while some assert that he poisoned himself. The disturbances continued for some time after his death; Russia was distracted, and fell into such a state of weakness that her neighbours vied with each other in encroaching on her territory: till at last arose the unanimous cry of "Death to the Impostor!" which, after some further commotions, was succeeded by the election of Michael Romanoff, a young man of sixteen years, to the throne. This choice was directed by the clergy, Michael being the son of Philaretos, the Patriarch of all the Russias; and it received the cordial support of the people owing to some ill-defined relationship that the Romanoffs bore, or pretended to bear, to the house of Rurik.

Michael ascended the throne in 1613, which commenced the fifth period of Russian history. Of the first period, the great sovereigns, we have seen, were Rurik, the founder; Oleg, the conquerer; Olga, the regent; Vladimir, the Christian; and Yaroslaf, the legislator. The second and third periods were less productive of great rulers, Vladimir Monomachus and Andrew having belonged to one, and Alexander Nevski, Ivan Kalita, and Dimitri Donski to the other; and throughout both of them the condition of Russia was one of much distress and despondency. The fourth period was that of deliverance, but unfortunately also of despotism; and the only great kings it produced—namely, Ivan the Autocrat, Ivan the Terrible, and Boris Godunof—were also those who riveted the chains most firmly on the people. In the first period the descendants of Rurik were all in all, and divided and subdivided the country among themselves, and were absolute masters, who did not permit the intervention of other classes. “I am a prince,” was the boast of the age, “and am not made to take advice from monks or the mob.” The subsequent weakness of the rulers brought the nobility to the foreground. The subjection of the people dates from the Tartar conquest, when slaves were asked for and given, and previous to which the infliction of corporal punishment was not known. In the reign of Ivan III. slavery was systematically established, the penalties enforced by his code being the knout, slavery, and death. It was he who first enforced blind servility, to which the people, already cowed down by the fear of the Tartars, submitted with willingness. Up to the time of Ivan IV. the ignorance of the Russians was so great that reading and writing were generally unknown. A people originally free was by these means thoroughly enslaved.

The reign of Alexis was chiefly famous for his war with the Poles, which resulted in the relinquishment by the king of Poland, in favour of the Czar, of the supremacy he had exercised till then over the Cossacks of the Ukraine. It was also distinguished by the re-establishment of commu-

nications with China, which had been interrupted, and by communication and trade with Persia being resumed. Internally, it was marked by a revolt, not against the authority of the Czar, but against that of his prime-minister, Morozoff, who exercised the sovereign power in a manner that exhausted the patience of the people. Rising *en masse*, they captured and killed the relatives of the minister, after which they laid siege to the palace. The Czar implored them to spare Morozoff; and this was agreed to on two or three other noblemen, his principal agents, being surrendered, whom they tore to pieces in their fury. This was quite a new thing in Russia. It was opposed to the creed of profound servility to which the people were habituated. A taste for sedition and blood being thus acquired, new troubles arose in other parts of the empire which had to be put down. In the east a brigand, a Cossack of the Don, emulating the audacity of Chingez and Timour, threatened to lay siege to Moscow and make it the tomb of the nobles, priests, and soldiers; but his luck and prudence were not equal to his boast, and on his being captured and quartered, the rest of Alexis's reign was undisturbed.

The greatest prince of the house of Romanoff was Peter the Great, of whom it is not necessary to say much, though very little cannot well be said of him. He was proclaimed sovereign jointly with Ivan V., his half-brother; and, both being minors at the time, his half-sister Sophia was appointed regent. Many attempts were made by Sophia to exclude Peter from the throne, and prolong her authority during the perpetual infancy of the weak-minded Ivan; but, at the age of seventeen, Peter was able to subvert her intrigues and defeat an attempt made to assassinate him, after which the tables were turned upon her, and she was shut up in a convent. Ivan dying a few years after, Peter became sole autocrat, and commenced a reign which is particularly instructive, as showing what an original mind, however barbarous, may achieve when left untrammelled to itself. The cruelties of the man were revolting; but his

regal acts were stupendously great—greater than the labours of any Hercules who had preceded him. The views of the king were singularly liberal for a mind so utterly unenlightened. His first act, we have said, was to defeat the plan laid against his life. A nocturnal conflagration had been designed by the Strelitz, at the instance of Sophia, in which he was to have been murdered. The plot was discovered, and the conspirators captured and punished—brutally, with all the ferocity of an exasperated barbarian. They were first put to the rack, then mutilated and killed; after which their heads and limbs were prominently exposed. This was to have been expected from the ferocity of the man and the times. The enmity of the Strelitz impressed on Peter the necessity of raising a body of land forces on whom he could depend, sufficiently strong to overpower opposition of any magnitude; and the idea was carried out as soon as it arose. The first nucleus of this army were fifty of the king's own companions in debauchery, whom he trained up personally for the service. This force was gradually augmented till it reached the modest strength of two hundred-thousand men; and to render it fully efficient, he got engineers and gunners from Germany, Holland, and Prussia, to instruct his soldiers. The idea of a fleet was similarly acquired by the sight of the remains of a sailing-boat, which was repaired for the Czar, and carried him afloat. Fifty young men were thereupon sent to Italy to learn the art of navigation, as forty young men had previously been sent to Germany to acquire military discipline. Not content with this, the Czar proceeded personally to foreign parts, and especially to Holland and England, to learn ship-building and other useful acquirements; and, on his return from those countries, he brought back with him not only artificers, but also geometricians and mathematicians to educate his people. A strong navy was now constructed, consisting of forty ships of the line, and two hundred galleys with sails and oars, and a multitude of experienced mariners was secured to man them.

His first tour carried Peter to Brandenburg, Denmark,

Holland, England, and Vienna, from the last of which places he intended to proceed to Venice and Rome, when he was recalled by the news of a general insurrection of the Strelitz at home. In a second tour he visited Holland again, and France. When he came back from his first tour, his army had already defeated and crushed out the rebellion; but this was not enough for the offended Czar. Seven thousand prisoners were hanged or beheaded, with every refinement of diabolical cruelty, Peter assisting in the execution with his own hands. Even the widows and children of the culprits were not left free, but deported to distant and desert places for crimes not their own; and all subsequent insurrections were similarly dealt with. His cruelties to his own family were equally fiendish. His first wife, Eudoxia Lapnkin, was divorced for adultery, imprisoned, and scourged, while her lover was impaled alive. His son by the divorced Czarina, having been tried for rebellion, was condemned and poisoned, the poison being administered by the infatuated father himself. The second wife was the widow of a Swedish soldier, captured amid the ruins of a pillaged town. She had two lovers before her marriage with the Czar, and one after that period, which was discovered only towards the termination of Peter's life, and was punished by the decapitation of the lover, though Catherine, for the many services she had rendered her husband, was spared.

The great object of Peter's life was to civilise his people. He became a soldier and a sailor to teach them the art of war by sea and land; after that he became a merchant and manufacturer, to teach them the arts of peace. In all his undertakings, perseverance was the prime agent; and he succeeded in teaching his people every branch of useful industry. He also introduced a multitude of reforms in civil and ecclesiastical affairs, and in the usages of society. For some of these reforms he was named "Antichrist" by the priests: but he gave more to the Church than he took away from her; and while he made the clergy more regular and learned, he gave them no real cause to be dissatisfied with

him, except that he abolished the Patriarchate, the honours of which were assumed by the Czar. His other achievements were the formation of a regular police, the establishment of a multitude of elementary schools and colleges for science, belles-lettres, and the arts, the establishment of a library, the formation of a botanical garden, &c. Besides all this, he founded St. Petersburg—a city larger than London itself, though of course neither so rich nor so well-peopled, and Cronstadt, which was completed by Nicholas, and which an English admiral, at the head of an English fleet of uncommon strength, was unable to bombard. What was better understood still was that he gave Russia six provinces, two seas, an extended commerce, fortresses and ports, and the army and navy to which we have referred. Well might such a man at his last moments, oppressed by a sense of his crimes and cruelties, cry out as he did—"I dare hope that God will look upon me with a merciful eye for all the good I have done to my country."

The military achievements of Peter were varied. He drove the Tartars and the Turks from the Crimea, which enabled him fully to open out the commerce with Persia through Georgia. His war with Charles XII. of Sweden is well-known. The intrepidity and valour of the Swede at first carried everything before him; but Peter stood his ground. "I know well," said he, "that the Swedes will have the advantage of us for a considerable time; but they will teach us at length to beat them." The experience required was gained; his army received that development which it stood in need of; and the royal Swede, defeated at Pultowa, was never able to recover. This gave Russia for the first time political consideration in Europe; and her sovereign was hailed by the potentates of all the neighbouring states by the title of Emperor. He proved less successful in a war with the Turks, being reduced to a disastrous state on the banks of the Pruth, from which he was extricated solely by the wit of his wife, who patched up a hasty peace with the Grand Vizier, which set him free. It is said that that wife afterwards, on her intrigue with

Moens being discovered, administered poison to him, of which he died. This, however, is by no means probable; it is more generally believed that he sank under the effects of his own debaucheries, being carried off by a venereal distemper for which the pharmacopœia of the age had no remedy.

The reigns of Catherine I., Peter II., Anne, and Elizabeth, do not present any features of particular interest. The last two were entirely governed by their favourites. Anne, ambitious of military glory, trained and fitted her army for European warfare by fighting with the Poles, Tartars, and Turks. In the reign of Elizabeth the Seven Years' War with Prussia was commenced, which was terminated by Peter III., who then proceeded to introduce various reforms into Russia. These gave dissatisfaction to his subjects, including the clergy, who were particularly scandalized at a mad order threatening their beards. He also incurred the displeasure of his wife, a sensual woman, who, conspiring against him, had him deposed and murdered, after which she ascended the throne herself as Catherine II. At this time morality was unknown in the imperial and aristocratic circles of Russia. Catherine had four or five lovers while her husband was living; after his death their number was counted by hundreds, the empress disdaining to cover her pleasures by a veil. Her personal aide-de-camp was constantly changed, and this officer always slept in the palace, in an apartment that communicated with that of his sovereign. But barring this weakness, the rule of Catherine was very vigorous, and historians have justly considered it as the most brilliant chapter in the history of Russia. She was a woman of uncommon abilities, whose active genius replaced Russia in the rank to which Peter I. had momentarily raised her. Her projects were as ambitious as those of Peter; she extended the limits of the empire in every direction, especially towards Constantinople, by annexing the Crimea and the adjacent country, and towards the Caspian. She also renewed with success the intercourse of Russia with China, opened an intercourse with Japan, and established on a salutary footing

the trade with Persia. Aspiring to every kind of celebrity, she gave her people a new code of laws, encouraged letters and the arts and sciences amongst them, and did everything to improve their manners and condition, convoking even a general council of deputies, in which representatives from the polar regions met face to face with those from the Crimea and the Caucasus. What her name, however, will best be remembered for is the partition of Poland, which was effected in concert with Prussia and Austria. The idea was that of Maria Theresa, or rather of her minister Kaunitz; but the principal agents to give effect to it were Frederick II. of Prussia and the Czarina. Russia obtained by that transaction an addition of more than two thousand square miles of territory, and one and a half million of subjects. The French Revolution broke out shortly after; but Catherine, though she promised assistance largely, was unable to do anything to put it down. The fact is, she had aggrandized Russia at the expense of her positive strength; and the consequence was, that towards the close of her reign the empire got enfeebled, from all its springs having become relaxed and impaired. She had firmness enough to refuse to share the throne with any of her favourites; but the very circumstance of their personal connection with her had given to scores and hundreds of knaves the option of abusing their influence. The resources of the empire were wasted by these drones, and all kinds of disorder and disorganization were introduced into the administration. An apoplexy carried off the great Messalina of the north, just when the lustre of her reign had commenced to grow dim. Some have it that she saw her husband's ghost, fell down with a shriek, and expired.

The Emperor Paul, known in history as the mad emperor, succeeded Catherine, and was contemporaneous with Napoleon I. The first league of Paul was with Austria against France; and four armies advanced at the voice of the autocrat from the confines of Asia to subjugate and crush the republican government. The victory of Marengo, which

delivered Italy to France and crushed the power of Austria, changed the sentiments of Paul into an admiration for Napoleon; and, the arrogation of a right of search on the seas by the British government having given him offence, he entered into an alliance with France for the overthrow of the British power. He also formed a confederation with Sweden, Denmark, and Prussia for the protection of trading vessels against the right claimed by England. Both the alliance and the confederation were frustrated by the assassination of Paul and Nelson's victory at Copenhagen. The former, Bonaparte insinuated, was brought about by the English government, from a fear of the combination of Russia with France, and particularly of the preparations made by the former for attacking India through Persia. "Paul," said the first consul, "died on the night of the 23rd March; the English fleet passed the Sound on the 30th: history will unveil the connection which existed between these events." The calumny, however, did not stick; it was even then well known that the death of Paul was due to the machinations, not of England, but of his own officers, and that the crime was participated in by his son. The number of conspirators was so great that no one was ever punished; and in the reign of Alexander I. many openly boasted of their share in the crime.

The history of Russia now becomes the history of Europe. The four principal events of the reign of Alexander I. were the treaty of Tilsit, the annexation of Finland, the burning of Moscow, and the capitulation of Paris. The elevation of the first consul to the imperial dignity gave rise to the rupture between Russia and France. Bent upon setting bounds to Bonaparte's ambition, Alexander joined Austria to repel his invasions, and shared in the defeat at Austerlitz. Continuing in the war, the Russians were again defeated at Friedland, subsequent to which peace was made between the emperors after a personal conference at Tilsit, where many secret engagements were exchanged for the partition of Europe and the establishment of a duocracy to divide the world between Russia and France. As usual,

however, each wanted the lion's share of the prize; and, unable to wait, Alexander marched against Sweden while Napoleon was yet fighting with Austria, took the gallant Gustavus by surprise, and annexed Finland with the whole of East Bothnia and a part of West Bothnia, on the sole pretext that the Swedes had not closed the ports of the Baltic against the English. Equally dexterous and successful was his policy on the side of Turkey, which he stripped of Bessarabia. He also wanted Wallachia and Moldavia; and, as Napoleon would not allow him to take them, there was a fresh rupture with France, which widened into the campaign of 1812. The march to Moscow, and the voluntary sacrifice of the city, which annihilated the hopes of Napoleon, were incidents unique in the history of the world. The French, who had the best personal knowledge of the event, have never attempted to imitate the heroism of the Russians, though they might have done so with credit on divers occasions. After her triumph, Russia assumed the protection of Germany, and actually did rescue her from the grasp of Napoleon, who was defeated by the allied armies at Leipsic. France was then entered and Paris occupied, and Napoleon compelled to abdicate and retire to Elba.

The reign of Nicholas was opposed at the outset by an ineffectual insurrection at St. Petersburg, and was afterwards distinguished by a short but successful war with Persia and the annexation of Georgia and Armenia, by the suppression of an insurrection in Poland, and by two wars with Turkey—one in 1828 and the other in 1854, Turkey being assisted on the latter occasion by France, England, and Sardinia, whereby Russia was defeated and Sebastopol taken and destroyed. The origin of this war, as explained by the secret and confidential communications of Russia to England, showed with what pertinacity the imperial government was pursuing its original scheme of aggrandizement, generally attributed to Peter the Great. The sick man was about to die; it was no longer necessary to maintain what did not admit of being propped up; if England would

allow the annexation of Turkey by Russia, Russia would leave her at liberty to take Egypt and Candia. The partition thus proposed was prevented for the time by the war that followed; but Russia is so rapacious and persistent that it is doubtful if it will be prevented long.

The most remarkable feature connected with Russia is the vastness of her territory and the immensity of her population, which is estimated at not less than eighty millions, allowing sixty-eight millions for European Russia and twelve millions for Russia in Asia. The preponderance which this gives Russia in the councils of Europe is apparent, since even united Germany does not count numbers so large. But, taking each entire empire as a whole, the subjects of Great Britain considerably outnumber even those of Russia, since India alone contains a population of one hundred and ninety-five millions, of which Bengal holds sixty-seven millions, or nearly as much as is owned by the whole of European Russia. Such being the case, it is rather surprising that the variety of races in Russia should be nearly as great as the variety in India, though it ought not to be more than a fifth greater than the variety in Bengal. The chief Russian divisions are the Slave—including the Poles and Cossacks; the Letts; the Finns; the Tartars—including the Mongols, Mantchous, and Caucasians; the Samojedes, the Ostraks, and the Armenians; with numerous subdivisions more broadly defined than even the main distinct races of India. The consequence is, that there is greater internal disunion within the Russian empire than perhaps within any other country either in Europe or Asia, which is only covered by the repressive despotism that rules over the empire. The people are absolutely at the mercy of their rulers: they have no intelligence, no aspirations, and no freedom whatever to speak of.

The vastness of Russia has been the result of her position, which left her no alternative but to swallow up all the neighbouring states. The empire of Rurik was confined to a small bit of territory in the north of European Russia.

Ivan III. conquered Astrakhán and Kasan; Ivan IV., Siberia; Alexis, the Ukraine; Peter I., most of the Baltic provinces; Catherine II., the western provinces of Lithuania, Podolia, and Volhynia, the southern portion of European Russia down to the Crimea, and a part of the Caucasus; while Alexander I. conquered Finland and Bothnia; and Nicholas added Armenia and Georgia, besides finally subduing the Poles. Over the whole of this territory Russia has now built fortresses and prisons, if not churches and hospitals also; large canals have been excavated; mines opened out; and manufactories established. Latterly, several railways also have been laid down, though a great extent of country is yet devoid of ordinary roads; and, to preserve a strong hold on the whole empire, it has been divided into eighty subordinate governments, with a governor over each. The manner in which all this consolidation has been effected has not been altogether blameless; but allowances must be made for the barbarism of the country and the races by which it is peopled. The Americans allot the whole old world to Russia, and very complacently apportion the whole new world to themselves. The wish implied in the division is never likely to fructify. But it fully recognises the importance which Russia has attained, though whether the large extent of her possessions is really of much benefit to her at present is a question that can only be very doubtfully answered.

Over all this vast dominion the emperor is uncontrolled autocrat, an expression which means much more in Russia than in Germany and Austria. An order of the emperor in the latter countries would doubtless be as promptly carried out as in Russia, but in them it would only be carried out by officers holding their places under the government; while in Russia, so great is the fear of the despot from one extremity of the empire to the other, it would be uncomplainingly carried out by the people also, even if it were prejudicial to themselves. The origin of this autocracy is to be traced to Ivan III., who assumed it with a view to break down the authority of the Tartars,

and restore peace to an empire that was distracted by petty tyrannies. He was helped in securing it by the people themselves, who suffered most from the state of anarchy that prevailed, and were anxious to find shelter under the imperial wings. It was enormously increased by the able lunatic Ivan IV., whose freaks of madness were never attempted to be circumscribed. The edifice was completed by Peter I., who finished by assuming the Pontificate, remarking, as he compared himself with Louis XIV., that, while the latter was under the orders of his priests, he, Peter, was above them. Enormous was the power and enormous the responsibility thus arrogated, but no one ever dreamt of objecting to it. Peter exterminated the Strelitz without one cry of vengeance being raised against him; Catherine II. deposed and assassinated her husband, but was acknowledged as empress by his subjects on bended knee; and yet, such misuse of power would probably not have been as quietly tolerated even by the slaves of China and Persia. In the case of Paul I. only, which is of later date than the others, was the idea first admitted that an autocrat when tyrannous might be opposed and killed. But, even in that instance, the idea would never have arisen save for the connivance of the son in his father's murder; and, after all, it was his nobles who killed him—there was no complaint against him from the people. The people throughout the history of the country are always seen as supporting the emperor's autocracy, which has shielded them at all times from the oppressions of the nobility, and the ill effects of which do not directly affect them. Hence the myth that the Czar is regarded as the father of his people; his power certainly is never questioned. Petty revolts of the people have occurred at times, but against the officers of the state, not against the imperial power.

"The Russian nobility," as Paul I. described it to the French ambassador, "consists of those persons only to whom the Czar speaks; and they are great only so long as he does speak to them." The first aristocracy of Russia

was composed of the followers of Rurik. The nobles of ducal blood were the personal relations of the sovereign and their progeny; the rest of the nobility being made up of military chiefs, who were called "boyars" and "voivodes" by the Slavs, from the terms "boi," meaning a battle, and "voijvoda," the leader of an army. When the custom of dividing the territories of the principality into appanages was adopted, the nobility of the first grade was enormously increased; but, on the unity of the empire being re-established by Ivan III., the princely houses were reduced to an equality with the other nobles, and all registered promiscuously in the national peerage. The official nobility of Russia was created by Peter I., and up to the reign of Peter III. no one was admitted into the aristocracy who had not served the Crown in a military or civil capacity, which necessarily made it compulsory on all hereditary nobles to take service; but since then such compulsion has not been held imperative, except in imminent need, when all the nobility are expected to turn out. The classes now are: hereditary nobles, who do not enter the service unless they wish it, and official nobles, who are such only for the appointments they hold. Of the former the power is entirely nominal, and the people show them no respect. The latter constitute a bureaucracy, and, acting in concert, retain all the patronage and authority of the government in their hands. The original rights of the aristocracy included the privilege of holding serfs, the option of entering the public service, and exemption from the payment of taxes and from corporal punishment. The first of these privileges has since been taken away, and the position of the nobleman who has no official status has necessarily become insignificant. It would have been absolutely so if the aristocracy did not include all the educated men in the country. In the past the nobles joined in many movements which gave trouble; but these consisted of conspiracies and murders: there was never any attempt made by them at constitutional resistance. What they are now particularly famous for is their official corruption. "The only person," said

Nicholas, "who is not a thief in my dominions is myself."

The government of Russia is strictly arbitrary. It is administered by a Council of the Empire, which has charge of all measures relating to home policy ; a Directing Senate, which promulgates and watches over the execution of imperial enactments ; and a Holy Synod, which attends to all ecclesiastical affairs. Over all these the emperor presides, either personally or by proxy ; and he is at all times at liberty to annul their decisions by an exercise of his will. The Council of the Empire consists of the princes and statesmen of the country, and the number of its members is necessarily indefinite. The Directing Senate is formed of the three first classes of the state, and comprises one hundred members ; but the people are not represented in it. The third assembly is entirely composed of clergymen, but, in the time of Nicholas, was presided over by a general of cavalry ! The ministerial functions of the empire are performed by ministries, which are eleven in number, and are subdivided into special sections and departments. They act independently of each other, and directly under the emperor's orders ; but nevertheless form together a board of government which is named the Council of Ministers.

The people of Russia have no voice in the government : nay, till recently, had no voice even in their own affairs. The Slavs, who formed the basis and the heart of the nation in European Russia, were originally free. The Varangians, or Russi, came and changed their laws and institutions ; but they were too few in number to reduce them to serfs. The position of the peasants in Russia up to the time of Ivan IV. was the same as in other countries generally. They were free, and worked either as farmers or as hired servants. It was Feodar who first prohibited the employment of hired servants ; and Boris Godunof, in improving on the idea, enacted, in the interests of the peasants, that they should not be liable to arbitrary expulsion from the soil. This was intended to check the tyranny of the wealthy boyars ; but it eventually led to the servitude of

the peasants. By a subsequent ordinance it was ruled that servants who worked by contract should not be allowed to quit their masters; and the operation of the two orders together reduced thousands and thousands of freemen to bondage to the soil. What was left unfinished by Boris was accomplished by Peter I., who made estates hereditary, and bound the serfs to their proprietors. Of course the serfs rose constantly against their masters, many of whom were killed; it was not in human nature to submit to such arrangements without a protest: but all their opposition only riveted the chains more strongly on them, till they got brutalized by habit and ceased to struggle. Alexis and Catherine II. were the only two sovereigns who thought of emancipating the peasants, but were not able to effect it. Nicholas attempted to alleviate their miseries; but his object was misunderstood, and led to a servile revolt. The gordian knot has since been cut through by Alexander II., by a general liberation of the serfs. It is said that that has not benefited them—that, on the contrary, it has much increased drunkenness amongst them, and made them improvident; but this is probably a one-sided representation. It has made the sovereign more popular than the autocrat of all the Russias ever was, notwithstanding all the deference he was accustomed to receive. His power now is based on the interests of his people: he is master of men who believe that all their hopes of safety and security rest in him, and in him alone. When they are better educated, their hopes and aspirations may take a different turn; and it is said that a strong desire for intellectual improvement is already developing itself among them. It may, nevertheless, be taken for granted that for a long time to come the power of the Czar over them is perfectly secure.

The civilisation of Russia is of recent growth, and dates from the time when St. Petersburg was founded, which enabled her to hold direct communication with Europe. Only a hundred and fifty years ago she had no possessions on either the Baltic or the Black Sea, and was necessarily nothing but an Asiatic power. Peter I. completed the

arrangements which made her a European power, and established free communication between her and the civilised states; and since then she has not only founded all her political institutions on the European model, but has established a thriving trade, and expanded a suddenly created navy. Even her wars with the western nations have been of benefit to her in refining her manners and conferring on her the first rudiments of practical and useful education. In the Crimean war the humanity shown to the wounded on the battle-field by the allies was a new lesson to the descendants of the Cossacks and Tartars, which they would not otherwise have acquired in half a century. They also learned from the war their immense need of railways and telegraphs; and, accepting the lesson loyally, have already benefited by it, by introducing both broadcast throughout their extensive dominions. These improvements have been supplemented by irrigation and the cultivation of the useful arts, by means of which the resources of the country have been largely increased within the last twenty-five years, and her commerce widely extended.

At this moment the external commerce of Russia is divided into two main branches, one being her commerce with the nations of Europe, the other her commerce with the nations of Asia; the first of which is carried on for ready-money and on credit as represented by bills of exchange, the other by barter or exchange of goods without credit in any shape. Her Asiatic commerce is chiefly carried on at Astrakhán and other ports of the Caspian, but has other depôts even up to the frontiers of China, which are daily increasing in number. But Russia is not satisfied with this success, nor was it to be expected that she would be. As compared with her bulk, her trade is yet in its infancy, particularly her sea traffic, which is represented by some two thousand and five hundred sea-going vessels only; and in other respects her improvements have been less. In letters and polity she has yet a name to establish: she has no poets, no philosophers, no historians whom she can point to with pride; no men of science, no artists, not even

any great captains or statesmen. Stories and tales are the principal branches of Russian literature at this moment; wit and poetry have been so little appreciated, that, as a rule, they have invariably been exiled to Siberia. Of late reviews and magazines have been started, which are generally ably conducted, and promise to become useful in the interests of popular education. As for religion, Russia embraced the Greek faith at the command of Vladimir. The Eastern empire was already tottering to its fall when this change was adopted. The Greek Church was bad enough then; it cannot be said that the Russian Church has become much better since. But great are the efforts now being made to enlighten the people; and this at least may be conceded, that western Russia is no longer the Tartar she was.

What Russia has chiefly directed her attention to is her army and navy. It would have been better if she had done so less; but it is said that she has a career chalked out for her which she must realize. The authenticity of Peter's Will has not been established. The 9th clause of the document known as such runs thus: "We must progress as much as possible in the direction of Constantinople and India. He who can get possession of those points is the real ruler of the world. With this view we must provoke constant quarrels—at one time with Turkey, at another with Persia. We must establish wharves and docks in the Euxine, and by degrees make ourselves masters of that sea as well as of the Baltic, which is a doubly important element in our plan. We must hasten the downfall of Persia; push on to the Persian Gulf; if possible re-establish the ancient commercial intercourse with the Levant through Syria, and force our way to the Indies, which are the storehouses of the world." This document, if genuine, was executed in 1725, or long before the English became masters of India, when the possibility of carrying out the idea in that direction was not hopeless. As the case now stands, great indeed must be the power that is able to achieve it; and it is more

than probable that no one has ever really thought of it but Paul I., the madman.

What Russia does actually want is sufficiently intelligible, and it is an idea of Peter the Great that she is anxious to carry out. Russia has been and is still an Asiatic power, and she naturally seeks dominion over as much of Asia as she can acquire and *hold*. The mission of civilisation is not a blind, as has been most uncharitably supposed, to cover a greed for territorial aggrandizement. It is a matter-of-course sequence which Russia could not avoid even if she desired to do so. Russia does seek plainly and undisguisedly the overthrow of all *native* rule in Central Asia. Her first conquests there began with the subjugation of Kasan in 1487, and they have since been uniformly continued for nearly four hundred years. A methodical direction was given to them by Peter the Great, who, having visited Astrakhán, in 1722, perceived that the gate to the Asiatic countries was through the land of the Khirgis; and from that time to this the efforts to expand through the Khirgis have been incessant. There is no mistake as to the policy followed. The majority of the Khirgis steppes are now under Russian rule, and, from 1847, the policy of founding permanent forts all over the conquered tract has been uniformly pursued. Just as England secured outposts all over the seas before asserting her proud pre-eminence over them, Russia is slowly but surely securing outposts all over Central Asia, where she will shortly be in a position to declare herself. But with the power of Russia her civilisation also is developing in the countries subjugated or brought under control. England did not go out to civilise India. First commerce, then conquest, and last diffusion of knowledge and the useful arts have followed; and such precisely is the Russian policy without a blind. One main difference pointed out as existing between Russia and England in Asia is this, that while the government of the former is a military one, that of the latter is a civil one; but the difference is more nominal than real, for England also holds India by the sword.

It would have been better if England alone had been the civiliser of all Asia, instead of having Russia for her coadjutor. But it cannot be so, since England has plenty of other work on her hands in her colonies, and all her energies would not suffice for both duties being well performed. Her civilisation, also, is not exactly what would best suit the present condition of Asia generally. In a reign of one hundred and twenty years in India, she has not been able to make any decisive impression on the people, except, at an immense interval, on the Parsees and the Bengalis. Russian civilisation, though much lower than that of England, is better understood and more easily adopted by semi-barbarous tribes. The exalted ideas of freedom, the ceaseless yearning for progress which distinguish the Briton, are hard, very hard lessons for the Asiatics to master. The civilisation of Russia is more compromising. It will not destroy native habits and ideas, but gradually transform them. The Englishman will carry his roast-beef and beer-bottle with him, and try to force them along with his notions of improvement. The Russian is an Asiatic himself, and will share the *chuppáti* of the Hindu, and drink *charná metro* with the Vysnub, and so induce them to come over to his side. Even conservative China communicates with Russia, and has done so for ages, though she kept the English at a distance as long as she could do so with impunity. As has been correctly observed by some one, the Asiatic, to become a European, must first be converted into a Russian. It would seem, therefore, that Central Asia has been designedly assigned by Providence to the charge of Russia for its amelioration, just as India has been especially given over to England, as having already a higher civilisation than Russia can impart, and which would therefore benefit better, though more slowly, under English rule.

Need England quarrel, then, with Russia with reference to Central Asian affairs? If so, wherefore? The geographical position of Russia throws upon her the onus of conquering and civilising the native states of Asia. England cannot prevent this, any more than Russia can prevent her

from colonising Australasia and Canada. Nor ought she to attempt to do it, since the progress of Russia in Asia has certainly been to the advantage of Asia. It is not in the power of Russia to take India, nor will she ever be so foolhardy as to attempt it. An attack on India is not possible except with the aid of the Afgháns; and the chance of Afghánistán becoming a Russian dependency, or in any way subservient to Russian interests, is a very distant contingency. The Afgháns will never be as easily brought under as the other races of Central Asia; and, should any attempt to subjugate them be made, the issue, with the assistance of British troops and British money to back them, need not be doubted. Of course, if Russia and England make up their minds to fight, a war can be got up; but that there is any necessity for it on one side or the other is not apparent. There is no reason whatever why England should not be able to form that definite and trustworthy alliance with Russia which would give Asia a century of development and peace. In the natural progress of things the Russian and the British territories may touch, though not in the direction of Afghánistán; but even that is no reason why they should quarrel.

Let us now see what the wants of Russia are, and we shall be able to understand what she actually aims at. Russia has no sea-room for her commerce and navy; the world's great ocean is virtually closed to her; no sufficiently wide gateway has she for her supplies; no broad range for her ships of war. The Northern Ocean, of which she has the whole seaboard, is blocked up by ice; the Baltic can at any time be blocked up by a few ships of war; the Black Sea has no outlet for her except under an enemy's guns, and to a sea where the English flag is all-powerful. This is a position to which no great nation can willingly submit, and it is not in the power of England, or of any other country, to force Russia to continue in it. We may take it for granted, then, that her eye is on Persia; that she wants access both to the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. She has already cleared her way for this at all

costs, and will declare herself as soon as she finds an opportunity to do so. From Astrabád to Herát, and from Herát to Persia, a regular army has an open way to go by; whereas in the Indian direction it would have to traverse Afghánistán, never easily accessible of itself.

But Russia wants something more than Persia. She wants, at the same time, to settle the Eastern question for good; to subvert the Mahomedan power in Turkey and Persia at one blow. This would not be a loss to England or to the world, nor could England prevent its consummation alone. In 1854, the war against Russia was waged by four distinct nations allied together. Two of those powers would not be able to afford the same assistance now if the question were reopened, as they have enough to do with their own affairs at home; and, if Russia could create difficulties for England in India, the problem as regards Turkey would solve itself, unless Germany were found willing to take up the position which France occupied on the previous occasion. It is no slur on England—a naval power—that she cannot check the progress of Russia alone on land; and there are many reasons why she should not attempt to do so. The enmity of Russia may convulse India again as she was convulsed during the Sepoy Mutiny, possibly not without Russian cognizance. There is no reason whatever for risking this for what England cannot prevent. England's safest course, therefore, is to let Russia have her own way, for that would make Russia absolutely harmless so far as purely English interests are concerned. The army of Russia is one of the strongest in Europe, though essentially not so powerful by organization and discipline as it is in numbers. She wants to develop her fleet to a similar extent—a mad idea, for the Russian will never make a sailor. But the whim may safely be allowed to take its course. England will not suffer in the slightest degree by Russia cleaving out her way through Constantinople to the Mediterranean, or through Persia to the Indian Ocean. The latter is, perhaps, at this moment as near to accomplishment as

Russia herself could wish. It will only necessitate the maintenance by England of an additional force of about fifteen thousand men on the banks of the Indus, and a larger navy than she has at present in the Indian Ocean for the protection of India and Australasia.

As yet Russia is not proceeding directly towards Persia, for there is no reason why she should show her cards before the right moment. It is even supposed by some that China is the real object of the Russian advance in Asia. For purposes of trade China has been open to Russia ever since Siberia was acquired in the reign of Ivan IV. She now threatens her more immediately from the west, but perhaps still only to acquire a commercial preponderance. It may, of course, be otherwise. The Muscovite is not unlikely to have more than one string to his bow. He will take China gladly if he can get her, but of that the certainty is not so great as of the conquest of Persia. An army of fifty thousand Russians would walk through Persia with ease; an army of one hundred-thousand Russians might do the same through China. But an army of two hundred-thousand men would in all probability never cross the Indus. It is true that India has been repeatedly invaded and conquered from the north-west, and so it might be again if her geographical defences only had to be overcome, and if the old conditions of her position and the old methods of warfare could be revived. The equipment of modern armies renders it perfectly impossible to convey the materials of war through long deserts and difficult mountains; and, while the invaders would necessarily be without such materials on their arrival in India, they would find the defenders amply provided with them. The European army in India, though small, is one of the most highly-finished instruments of war in the world; and, taking India by herself, without reference to any extraneous assistance she could, or could not, receive, England is there strong enough to defy any power that Russia could bring to bear on her. The European army of Russia has enough to do in watching the armies of Prussia and Austria, and

no portion of it could be withdrawn, even during the profoundest peace in Europe. In Asia she has in all about two hundred-thousand troops; and these are fully employed in keeping down the warlike population of Central Asia, now held by her under subjection. Not more than twenty thousand men of this army are available for offensive purposes; and very extraordinary measures could do no more than double or treble that number. Of course Russia could, if she wished it, increase her forces by drawing on the innumerable nomad hordes of Asia. But, in the first place, it is doubtful if those hordes would not themselves form her chief enemies; and, even if they were friendly to her, such undisciplined levies would only act as a dead weight on her. Britain, on her side, has an inexhaustible store of military races in India to draw upon; and if half a century more intervenes before the rupture breaks out, India will have become too strongly consolidated for the whole of Russia, European and Asiatic taken together, to make the slightest impression on her.

All that Russia could do in India, therefore, virtually resolves itself to this: she could stir up troubles against the English by exciting mutiny and rebellion. But that is a game which two can play at; and the hold of Russia in Central Asia is certainly more insecure than the hold of Great Britain on India. The purse of England can do more. There are plenty of combustible materials throughout the Russian empire. Poland still sighs for the liberty she has lost; the Cossacks hate the Russian rule; the Circassians still dream of independence; even the Siberians are not well reconciled to their condition. It is therefore in the power of England to raise a tempest in Russia which all the strength of the northern giant may not be able to allay.

The extent of her territory renders, or rather will eventually render Russia capable of producing every commodity required for ensuring her greatness. At present, however, her conquests, in their backward state, are but a burden to her. She will require more than a century to lick them

into shape; and if, instead of following the paths of ambition, she devoted her energies to this object only, her position among nations would be much higher than it now really is. It is simply out of courtesy that she is recognised as a civilised power. She has been straining every nerve to attain European civilisation; but, even in European Russia, all the civilisation she has acquired is confined to the higher classes only, and has not penetrated the manners and customs of the lower classes. An educated or civilised Russian is not a Russian in the same sense as an educated Frenchman is a Frenchman, and an educated Englishman an Englishman—that is, one of the mass; while, further to the east, the Asiatic Russian is really more uncivilised than the Chinaman or the Hindu.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MINOR STATES OF EUROPE.

THE remaining states of Europe do not require such lengthened notice as we have given to the primary powers. Some of them, it is true, have had their eras of greatness, especially Spain, Portugal, and Holland; but their present weakness and imbecility are too great to hold out any promise of a very brilliant career in the future, and a brief allusion to their past will therefore fully suffice for that comprehensive view of the whole world which we are anxious to furnish. The best phases of their existence have long disappeared; with the exception of Italy, not one of them is making any exertion to recover lost ground; no anticipations for the future arise in reading of them. Though belonging to the modern world, they are already of the past.

Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.

In the north of Europe are the states of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, which were originally known by the general name of Scandinavia, which has a very interesting history of its own. The Swedes and the Danes trace their descent from Noah to Odin, and the Norwegians from Noah to Thor; but the accounts they give are based on tradition only, a fair part of which may nevertheless be true. Odin, according to Saxo-Grammaticus, was a king of the Hellespont, and apparently a Scythian, who proceeded in the direction of Germany and Scandinavia immediately after the fall of Troy. The aborigines of Scandinavia before this period were a few Lapps and Finns, who, from this time forward, were frequently overrun by immigrants from the south, the best known among whom

were the Cimbri and the Goths. The people derived from a mixture of these races began to make themselves inconveniently known to their neighbours in the early ages of the Christian era by their piracies at sea. They were divided into tribes, each of which formed itself into a distinct community, subject to its own Jarl. The lands held by them were poor, and they had little disposition either for agriculture or trade; the whole of their life, therefore, was devoted to maritime expeditions. The age was that of giants and magicians, and of deeds of great hardihood and valour; and the traditions of the race are replete with accounts of both. In the ninth century Denmark was formed into a regular government by Gorm I., and Norway by Harold Haarfager (the fair-haired), who became their first kings respectively. Sweden was later in adopting a similar organization, which she received from Eric, in 1001. But these changes did not give general satisfaction, and many of the pirate chiefs, embarking in their own ships, went away in disgust to Iceland, and the Faröe, Shetland, and Orkney isles, whence they annually ravaged the coasts of their old country; while others contented themselves by periodical depredations on the coasts of Britain and France. In Britain these invaders were best known as Danes, in France as Northmen or Normans, names which were regarded with equal terror in both countries. They also extended their power eastward, on the coasts of the Baltic, where they were known by the name of Varangians; and, after establishing themselves in Russia, passed down to Byzantium, where, for a long period, the Varangian guard of the emperor was the most faithful support of his throne.

Christianity was introduced into Denmark between the eighth and ninth centuries, and was extended thence to Sweden and Norway. In the eleventh century Denmark and Norway were united under the rule of Canute the Great, who also reigned over England, which had been conquered by his father Sweyn. In the fourteenth century the race of Odin in Sweden became extinct, and the ancient

dynasties of Denmark and Norway ended at the same time in the person of a female named Margaret Waldemar, known as the Semiramis of the North, who, conquering Sweden, united the three kingdoms into one empire, an amalgamation which did not outlast her life. The kingdoms of Norway and Denmark remained united down to the nineteenth century; but Sweden, refusing to accept the German dynasty that was established in them after the death of Margaret, seceded from the union and set up a distinct king for herself, her independence being finally established by Gustavus Vasa, in 1523. The Protestant religion was introduced into Sweden during the reign of this prince, who also succeeded in laying the foundation of that greatness which the country was able shortly after to attain. His grandson, Gustavus Adolphus, raised the martial reputation of the Swedes to a point which had never been reached before by it. He was invited by the Protestant princes of Germany to place himself at their head and oppose the scheme of Austria to restore the supremacy of the Pope over Christendom; and his career of glory fully justified the choice. He fell at the battle of Lützen; but the statesmen and generals brought up in his school were quite able to sustain the success he had secured, till the Thirty Years' War was terminated by the peace of Westphalia, from which period Sweden, from being an obscure state in Europe, assumed a foremost place.

The reign of Charles X. was also glorious, though he was obliged to relinquish many of his conquests by a confederacy formed against him by Denmark, Russia, and Germany: it was the madness of Charles XII. that plunged Sweden neck-deep in ruin. The military talents of this sovereign were of the highest order, and he led his people to a succession of triumphs by crushing his enemies with a rapidity which can only be compared with the conquests of Napoleon I. a hundred years later. But, becoming intoxicated with success, he determined to conquer Russia, which caused the destruction of his splendid army at Pultowa, and

shattered the national power. After his death the Swedish crown became elective, but was again made hereditary under Charles XIII.; and on his dying without heirs, Marshal Bernadotte, one of the ablest generals of the French Republic, was chosen to succeed him. In 1812, the Swedes under Bernadotte joined the coalition against Napoleon, and did good service during the campaign of 1813-14, which was rewarded at the general pacification of Europe by the gift of Norway wrested from Denmark. The glorious eras of Gustavus Vasa and Gustavus Adolphus have never been renewed in their country; but its resources have since been largely developed, and the condition of the people greatly ameliorated; and more peace and prosperity have been enjoyed under the dynasty of Bernadotte than at any previous period. The present government is monarchical, but controlled by a diet, consisting of two chambers, both elected by the people, and representing all classes, namely, the nobility, clergy, burgesses, and peasants. The religion is Protestant; great attention is paid all over the country to the education of the people; and the press is free. The intellect of the nation has been vindicated by the names of Puffendorf, Tycho Brahe, Linnæus, Berzelius, Geyer, and many others equally distinguished. In most of the large towns there are extensive libraries; and there are also first-class literary and scientific societies in the country, though of very unostentatious character.

The history of Denmark makes little noise in Europe after the reign of Margaret Waldemar. In 1448, a German dynasty was established on the throne in the person of Christian I., when Sleswig and Holstein were annexed to Denmark. We all know how violently they have since been disunited from her. But, perhaps, the greatest injury she has received from any power was that inflicted on her by England, in 1807, when the Danish fleet was destroyed by Nelson to prevent its falling into the hands of Bonaparte. It was after that that Norway was forcibly wrested from her to be given away to Sweden, which completed her reduction and humiliation. Notwithstanding these indic-

tions, the national spirit in Denmark has been reawakened; and if England will only make amends for the past and countenance the Danes with her support, they may yet establish a name and consolidate their power in the future, the opportunity for which may shortly arise. The government of Denmark is monarchical, with a Rigsdag, or diet, composed of a senate and a house of commons, to advise the Crown. The people are simple-minded, contented, and honest. Nowhere has more been done for the extension of popular education. The authors of Denmark also occupy an honourable position.

Norway has no history apart from the history of Denmark and Sweden. Oscar I. gave the Norwegians a separate flag, and also decreed that in all acts and public documents relating to Norway the king shall be called King of Norway and Sweden, and not of Sweden and Norway, as was previously the practice; and with these concessions the Norwegians seem to be well satisfied. The rights of the king and people have been clearly defined since 1814, or the time of annexation with Sweden. The Storting, an elective assembly, represents the governed in the constitution of their country. It has two houses, the upper and the common, the latter of which initiates all enactments. There is no hereditary nobility in Norway. The religion is Protestant, and remains exactly in the state it was in when Catholicism was subverted by Luther. The education of the people is not of a high standard; but it is rare to find any one in Norway who is unable to read and write. The people are very hospitable, and, as a rule, very partial to agricultural pursuits.

Holland and Belgium.

The next states to notice, as we run downwards, are Holland and Belgium, known in the past by the name of the Netherlands, from their situation at the mouths of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, and from their being protected by dykes and embankments from the sea. They were originally occupied by the Celts, being afterwards

acquired by the Franks and the Saxons, the latter of whom formed the bulk of the population in the maritime provinces. In the time of Charlemagne the whole territory was annexed to France, but afterwards became independent under its several chiefs, known as the Counts of Flanders, Hainault, Brabant, and Holland, at about the same time that the Germans elected a separate emperor for themselves. The states very early grew wealthy by trade. The swampy and unproductive nature of their soil led the inhabitants to collect into cities for mutual assistance, and these acquired power and privileges which very much increased their importance. The principal cities were Bruges, Ghent, Brussels, Antwerp, and Liege; and also Leyden and Amsterdam, which were of later growth. Many efforts were made to suppress them, but they were generally unsuccessful.

In the fourteenth century, Philip, duke of Burgundy, became possessed of the entire territory, partly by conquest and partly by inheritance; and from the house of Burgundy it was transferred to that of Austria on the marriage of Mary, the daughter of Charles the Bold, with Maximilian, who became emperor of Germany, in 1493. In the time of Charles V. the states were in a very flourishing condition, and the great towns were the chief marts of northern Europe. They were also the centres of civilisation in that age, excelling not only in manufactures, but also in literature and the arts. The paintings of the Flemish school were particularly celebrated; and societies for the cultivation of poetry were formed in every town. The Reformation also made extensive progress in them, which gave particular offence to Philip II. of Spain when he obtained the Netherlands in succession to Charles. He disliked equally the people and their new faith, and determining to suppress both, sent the duke of Alva as governor, with a large army to carry out his intentions. The cruelties perpetrated by Alva were execrable: the Inquisition was established by him to enforce the Catholic religion, and eighteen thousand prisoners were delivered over to the executioner within a space of six

years, for daring to resist its authority. But the severity of his measures defeated the end held in view by him. The people were exasperated, and made a desperate opposition, which was headed by the dukes of Egmont and Horn, and the prince of Orange. First Holland, and then Zealand, cast off the Spanish yoke; and, by 1579, a union was effected by seven provinces—namely, Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friesland, Groningen, Overysse, and Guelderland, under the designation of the Seven United Provinces—and their sovereignty offered first to Elizabeth of England, and, on her refusing it, to the duke of Anjou. The war with Spain was in the meantime continued with great spirit, and in the prosecution of it the states were vigorously assisted by the English; till, after a contest of thirty-seven years, Spain was obliged to acknowledge their independence in 1609, when they accepted the government of a Council of Deputies, with a chief, or Stadtholder, at its head to exercise the executive power. }

During the conflict with Spain the United Provinces increased greatly in wealth, acquired extensive provinces in the East, and formed a strong navy. They continued, however, to be internally disturbed by religious dissensions, and externally from having sided with France in her wars with Spain. They also got involved in disputes with England in connection with the commercial enterprises carried on by both in the East; and it was in the prosecution of this war that a Dutch fleet sailed up the Thames and burned several English ships at Chatham. The ambition of Louis XIV. subsequently set the whole of Europe ablaze, closing all minor differences for the time; and the Dutch, his immediate neighbours, were so hard-pressed by him, that they prepared at one time to leave their country and settle in their possessions in the East. This was rendered unnecessary by the valour and ability of their Stadtholder, William of Orange, afterwards king of England; and, on his accession to the English throne, the Dutch were combined with the English, and fought together till the power of Louis was annihilated.

All this time the western provinces of the Netherlands, which had retained the Catholic religion, had remained under the allegiance of Spain. They were transferred to the house of Austria by the peace of Utrecht, in 1713, being afterwards annexed to France during the wars of the Revolution, when Holland, under the name of the Batavian Republic, declared herself to be the inseparable ally of France. In the time of Napoleon I. the Republic was first changed into a monarchy under his brother Louis, and afterwards, on Louis's abdication, annexed to France. The United Provinces were thus entirely ruined, till, after the fall of Napoleon, the whole of the Netherlands were again formed into one state by the Allies, and placed under the king of Holland, with the title of the king of Belgium. The object of this arrangement was the formation of a solid bulwark against the ambition of France. But the elements put together were heterogeneous and did not adhere, which gave rise to a conflict of interests, and, expelling the Dutch from their country, the Belgians became independent, in 1830. The two divisions of the Netherlands have since remained distinct. The people of both are famed for their great perseverance and mercantile good faith, but they do not cut any important figure now in the history of the world. Both Holland and Belgium have copied the English system of government best—better than any other country in Europe except Italy. In Holland the whole legislative authority is vested in a Parliament composed of two chambers, called the States-General, while the executive authority is exercised by the king, aided by a responsible council of ministers. In Belgium all authority is vested conjointly in the king, a chamber of representatives, and the senate; the members of both houses being chosen by the people.

Switzerland.

Switzerland is the centre of the high Alps lying between the confines of Germany, France, and Italy, where the largest rivers of Europe take their rise, and where inacces-

sible valleys are surrounded by rocks which render the place impregnable by nature. This country was known to ancient Rome as the home of the Helvetians; and, in the later migration of nations, was overrun by the Alemanni, the Burgundians, and the Longobards. These three races were afterwards united under the sceptre of France; and, on the division of the French monarchy, Switzerland became a part of the kingdom of Burgundy. According to the prevailing system of the times, it was broken up under the feudal law into a number of petty baronies, amidst which several free towns enjoyed political consideration, especially those in the bosom of the mountains, which were called forest cities, and were known by the names of Schwytz, Uri, and Unterwalden.

The most powerful of the Swiss barons were the counts of Hapsburg; and when one of them, Rodolph, was elected emperor of Germany, the greater part of Switzerland owned allegiance to him, and in that way became a part of the possessions of Austria, which Rodolph acquired as the distinct appanage of his family. This eventually led to the entire separation and independence of Switzerland. Albert, the son of Rodolph, not content with the possession of that portion of Switzerland which had voluntarily joined Austria, tried to force the forest-cantons also to obedience, and placed over them tyrannical governors, who by their oppressions drove the people to rebellion. The story of Tell and Gesler's hat has been referred to. The first to renounce Austrian authority were the cantons of Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwalden. They were afterwards joined by the cantons of Lucerne, Zurich, Berne, Zug, Glaris, Friburg, Soleure, Basle, Schaffhausen, and Appenzel. Leopold, the son of Albert, attempting to re-enforce their submission at the head of an army, was defeated with great slaughter at Morgarten, after which the independence of Switzerland was recognised.

The arrogant pretensions of Hagenbach, the Burgundian governor of Alsace, involved the Swiss subsequently in a war with Charles the Bold. But a proud consciousness of

their power and liberty made the mountaineers more than a match for that leader of armies, who was thrice signally defeated by them at Granson, Murten, and Nancy, and killed in the last engagement, after which his dominions were dismembered. Two further attempts to reduce the Swiss were made by the house of Austria, in 1386 and 1389 respectively, the first of which was defeated by the battle of Sempach—one of the most glorious in the records of liberty—and the second, by the battle of Näfels. Austria, humbled by these reverses, sold off her estates in Switzerland to the Swiss, after which the confederated states began to develop more fully, till quarrels arose among themselves. In one of these the French, siding with the state of Zurich against the rest, were signally defeated near St. James on the Birs, their success leaving the mountaineers for some time at peace, from which they largely benefited. During the revolutionary wars Switzerland was invaded and occupied by the French, in 1798, her old constitution subverted, and a new constitution given to her with the title of the Helvetic Republic. Next, Bonaparte made her a province of France; but she regained her independence on the occupation of Paris by the Allies, and resumed her former system of government.

Since then, Switzerland has well cultivated the arts of peace. Her practical improvements in the culture of the soil have been only surpassed by her improvements in the culture of the mind. The learned establishments in Switzerland are many, and are respected throughout all Europe. The national religion is Protestantism, as it was understood and expounded by Zwingli; but in some places, especially in Geneva, the prevalent faith is that of Calvin. The national character has also improved. The system of sending out the youths of the country as mercenaries into foreign service, obtained for a long time after the defensive wars were terminated, and almost made the terms "Swiss" and "hireling" synonymous. The masses of the people have now awakened to higher and better-directed aspirations. Invention and enterprise have opened out new paths of

advancement to them, and the progress of industry has been very considerable. The government is republican, each canton being represented by its own deputies; and in some respects the form is better—that is, less open to corruption—than that of the United States.

Spain.

We now come to the southern provinces of Europe, and commence with Spain and Portugal, which outflank the continent on the west. Spain was originally inhabited by the Celts and the Iberians, who were conquered by the Carthaginians, from whom the country was taken by the Romans. On the destruction of the Roman empire it was overrun by the Vandals, the Suevi, and the Alans, and finally by the Visigoths, who settled in it in 410, and embraced the Catholic faith. The first monarch of all Spain was Leuvigild. A large portion of the history of the period is made up of usurpations and murders; but the kingdom was for a long time free from foreign warfare, which contributed greatly to its internal weakness. In the reign of Roderick, an usurper, Count Julian, governor of Ceuta and Andalusia, who sided with the rightful heirs, and had an injury of his own—the violation of his daughter by Roderick—to avenge, invited over the Arabs from Africa. The invaders were led by Tárik, after whom Gibraltar—*Djebel-el-Tárik*, or the rock of Tárik—is named; and they defeated Roderick, who was drowned in the Guadalquivir. Tárik then passed through the country, which submitted to him without resistance; and he did not stop till he beheld the Bay of Biscay. His chief in Africa, Musá, came over next, and completed the subjugation of the rest of the kingdom, with the exception of Asturias, where a valiant remnant of the Goths defended themselves under Pelayo, against the Arabian power.

The first Arab governors of Spain were officers of the Kaliphs of Bagdad, of the house of Ommiyáh; and one of these passed the Pyrenees and penetrated into France,

which he actually conquered from the Garonne to the Rhone, but whence he was subsequently expelled by Charles Martel, and killed in his flight. When the Ommiyade Kaliphs were deposed, one member of the family, Abderrahmán, escaping from Africa into Spain, was proclaimed Kaliph, in 755. His descendants ruled in Spain for nearly two centuries; and when all Europe was sunk in darkness, they patronised the sciences and the arts, and diffused civilisation and refinement from the headquarters they had established. The internal disputes of the Arabs were the only cause of their decline. The emirs, rebelling against the authority of the kings, established little independent kingdoms for themselves, which diminished the royal power; and the Christians of Asturias, taking advantage of their disputes, gradually extended their possessions from the mountains to the plains. The kingdoms thus formed were Leon, Castile, Arragon, Catalonia, and Navarre. For a long time, however, the Moors were able, with constant reinforcements from Africa, to retain possession of the rest of the country—that is, all to the south of the mountains of Castile.

The wars between the Christians and the Moors excited in both parties the lofty and chivalrous spirit for which the residents of Spain were for a long time famous. Gradually, the Christian states gained ground while the Mahomedan states lost it, till by the middle of the thirteenth century the Moors were limited to Granada and Murcia, which they were able to retain mainly from the mutual wars and jealousies of the Christians. This continued to the end of the fifteenth century, when, Ferdinand of Arragon having married Isabella, queen of Castile, those two monarchies were united into one kingdom, which began gradually to absorb the other states. Navarre only passed continually by females to France, notwithstanding which, a great portion of it was annexed to Arragon.

It was during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella that Granada was taken after ten years of incessant warfare, which finally closed a conflict of eight centuries, and ob-

tained for Ferdinand the title of the Father of the Spanish monarchy. The era was also famous for the discovery of America by Columbus, through the patronage of Isabella. But simultaneous with these achievements was the establishment of the Inquisition in Castile, a tribunal which sat in secret upon all persons suspected of disbelieving the Roman Catholic religion, and which first directed its operation against the Jews. It was the erection of this tribunal, and the close connection it maintained with the throne, that contributed most to the decline of Spain. In the reign of Charles V. of Germany and I. of Spain, Cortez and Pizarro conquered the empires of Mexico and Peru with a degree of heroism and cruelty which were equally astounding, both of which very soon reacted on the national character, by raising it in one direction and degrading it in another.

The successor of Charles on the Spanish throne was Philip II., who sent the invincible Armada against England, and spent much blood and treasure in supporting the Catholics of France. In his reign the Netherlands were lost to Spain, and also most of the Spanish possessions in the East. His successor, Philip III., expelled the Moriscoes, or Mahomedan population, from Spain, whereby a million of very industrious subjects were unwisely sent adrift. In the reign of Philip IV. the Catalans rebelled, the Portuguese, who had been united with the Spaniards in the reign of Philip II., threw off the Spanish yoke, and the independence of the Netherlands had to be acknowledged. The decline of Spain from this time was rapid; the rust had already commenced to corrode her power.

The death of Charles II. without issue, in 1701, gave rise to the war of the Spanish succession, which was continued for twelve years. Charles had bequeathed the crown to Philip of Anjou, the second son of the dauphin of France and great-grandson of Louis XIV.; but this arrangement was disputed by Leopold, emperor of Austria, who, as grandson of Philip III., claimed the crown on behalf of his son Charles. England and Holland supported the

claim of Leopold, being averse to the further aggrandizement of France; and the wars of the Allies, conducted under the lead of Marlborough and Eugene, were successful alike in Italy, Germany, and France. But, as the people of Spain refused to accept Charles for their king, the cause of Philip of Anjou was eventually gained.

The wars of the French Revolution did not disturb Spain much, Charles IV. having early made peace with France on his troops being defeated. But the Spanish nation hated the French, and this gave rise to quarrels between Charles and his son Ferdinand, who took the popular side. Napoleon I., becoming cognizant of these dissensions, undertook to mediate between father and son, and getting them both in his power, put them in confinement, while he sent troops to occupy Spain, which caused a general rising of the nation against him. Bonaparte made his brother Joseph king of the country; but his authority was nowhere acknowledged except in the presence of the French armies. For some time the Spaniards fought well, but they were subsequently crushed down; whereupon the English stepped forward to reanimate them. The British army, which had operated successfully in Portugal, marched thence to Spain; and Wellington being placed at the head of the allied forces, the French were repeatedly defeated, and compelled to evacuate the peninsula. Spain thus owed her deliverance entirely to the vigour of the English arms; but in Spanish history it is deliberately recorded that the Spaniards drove out the French, and were aided by the English!

Ferdinand VII. was restored to the throne after the victories of Wellington, and re-established the government on a despotic footing, reviving the Inquisition, and dismissing the Cortes. From the earliest times the government of Spain was a mixed monarchy; and a popular assembly called the Cortes, which was composed of the nobles and deputies from the cities, controlled the king. But Charles V. (I. of Spain) and his successors, aspiring to absolute power, removed this check upon their

authority, and Ferdinand followed the same course. He was succeeded by his daughter Isabella II., a minor, whose reign was much disturbed by the pretensions of Don Carlos, a nephew of Ferdinand, who contended that Isabella's claim was barred by *salique* law. Against him was formed the Quadruple Alliance, whereby England, France, Spain, and Portugal bound themselves to secure the throne of Spain to the daughter of Ferdinand and her line, to the exclusion of Don Carlos and his heirs, and the throne of Portugal to the female line of the house of Braganza, to the exclusion of Don Miguel and his heirs; the result of which was the overthrow of Don Carlos in Spain. The subsequent bad conduct of Isabella, after she came of age and was married, gave great offence to her people, and obliged her to seek safety by flight into France, upon which the kingdom was first offered to Prince Amadeus of Savoy, and then placed under a republican form of government which was recognised by the Great Powers. The Carlist movement having also revived, the country was for a long time much distracted by civil wars till a new revolution placed Alphonso XII., the son of Isabella, on the throne. The cause of the Carlist party was mainly upheld by the priests; but the people, who detest the domination of priestcraft, were exceedingly averse to it.

At one time the Spaniards were the greatest people in Europe; but they have long, very long, descended from that height, and are now about the most ignorant and depraved. The splendour and activity of the reign of Charles I. were well-suited to literary exertions, and a number of eminent writers flourished in that and the following reigns, among whom were Calderon, Lope de Vega, and Cervantes; but the subsequent administrations of the country have not been equally favourable either to letters or to greatness in any shape. The forms of a free government are aped both in Spain and Portugal; but, in the absence of a real spirit of freedom in the nations, they work only as instruments of arbitrary power. The Cortes of Spain is composed of a senate and congress

both of which are equal in authority, or rather equally destitute of power.

Portugal.

Previous to the eleventh century, Portugal, anciently called Lusitania, formed a part of Spain, and with it passed successively under the domination of the Romans, the Suevi, the Goths, and the Arabs. In 1085, Alphonso VI., king of Castile, captured from the Arabs the ancient city of Toledo, knights from all countries of Christendom participating in the conquest. Particular distinction was won on the occasion by Henry, a young knight of Burgundy, who was rewarded for the service by the hand of a daughter of Alphonso, and the government of all the country lying between the mouths of the Douro and the Tagus. This territory Henry increased still further by conquests from the infidels, among which was the city of Porto, after which the entire province was named Portugal. Alphonso, the son of Henry, fought with a success greater even than that of his father; and, conquering the large and fertile province of Alentejo, was by his victorious army saluted "king" on the field of battle, from which time Portugal became a distinct kingdom, which Alphonso consolidated by wise institutions and laws.

The descendants of Alphonso I. reigned in uninterrupted succession till the time of Alphonso III., who was compelled by Alphonso X. of Castile to attend him in his wars with fifty lances. This mark of dependence was afterwards dropped in the reign of Dionysius the Wise, when the country was further aggrandized. It was aggrandized still more under Pedro I., an able, just, and vigorous ruler, who nevertheless obtained a bad name for contending against the powers of the Church, which he greatly reduced. His successor, Ferdinand, left an only daughter married to John, king of Castile, who claimed the succession on behalf of his wife. Most of the grandees of the country favoured his claim; but the people were more mindful of national liberty, and elected in preference John, a natural son of

Pedro, who, defeating the Castilian army, reigned for forty-eight years, justifying the choice of his subjects by rendering that period the most brilliant that Portugal had yet witnessed. It was in his reign that the Portuguese crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and conquered Ceuta from the Moors. More glorious still, the great voyages of discovery were now commenced, principally under the direction of the king's son, Henry, who was much attached to the study of navigation and geography. Madeira and the Azores were in consequence occupied and added to the Portuguese dominions, and the coast of Africa was explored.

Alphonso V. conquered Tangiers from the Moors. In the reign of John II. settlements were made on the Gold Coast of Africa, and the Cape of Good Hope was discovered and doubled by Diaz. Then followed the golden but guilty period of Emanuel, when Vasco de Gama proceeded to the East Indies, and, after him, Alphonso Albuquerque, by whom the native states were forced to acknowledge the supremacy of Portugal, which brought little advantage to them, while it saddled them with the thralldom of a bigoted intolerance that proceeded so far as to establish the Inquisition at Goá. The places landed at, and where settlements were formed, were Ormus, Goá, Calicut, Cochin, Canará, Malábar, Malaccá, and Macáo; and for more than half a century these possessions were maintained vigorously, which promoted commerce, but at the cost of an oppression and rapacity that no subsequent adventurers from the West ever ventured to emulate.

The Inquisition was introduced into Portugal and her dependencies during the reign of John III., which was in other respects as illustrious as that of his father Emanuel. This was the commencement of Portugal's decline. The Jesuits educated Sebastian, the grandson of John, who remained obedient to them after he came to the throne, whereby the priestly and regal authorities were made to combine for the oppression and degradation of the people. At the suggestion of the Jesuits, Sebastian undertook a crusade against the Moors in Africa, and being defeated by

them, disappeared, being supposed by some to have been buried under the slain, and by others to have escaped into the wilderness. His uncle, Cardinal Henry, succeeded him, but, dying shortly after, the succession was claimed and usurped by Philip II. of Spain, a son of Isabella, the eldest daughter of Emanuel.

This arrangement was most unfortunate for Portugal, as it saddled her with all the enemies of Spain. Her possessions in the East were now wrested from her by the Dutch and the English; the Sháh of Persia resumed his hold of Ormus: and the merchandise of Portugal was waylaid on the high seas and captured. Simultaneously with these disasters, an odious and oppressive government was introduced into Portugal by the king of Spain, accompanied by the usual abuses and severities of foreign domination, among which was the bestowal of all the most important and lucrative offices of the state on Spaniards alone. This continued for sixty years, after which the Portuguese, unable to bear the yoke longer, threw it off in 1640, during the reign of Philip IV. of Spain, electing John, duke of Braganza, descended from the former royal family of Portugal, as their king.

The independence of Portugal was thus regained; but her power had already considerably declined, and she was never able to reassert it. In 1755, Lisbon, the capital of the country, was nearly destroyed by an earthquake, in which fifty thousand persons are supposed to have perished; but in the greater earthquake of the French Revolution, which followed forty years after, Portugal was not involved. Her respite, however, was terminated as soon as Napoleon I. stepped to the foreground, when the country was occupied by a French army, in the reign of Maria Francesca, an imbecile, upon which the regent, being unable to resist the invaders, sailed off with the whole Court to Rio Janeiro, an important Portuguese settlement in South America. A protective alliance had long subsisted between England and Portugal, and it now gave rise to the interference of the English in the affairs of both Portugal and Spain, which

led to their being saved. A British force sent to Portugal compelled the French to fall back into Spain, and the British and Portuguese pursuing them thither contributed chiefly to their expulsion from the entire peninsula. The Portuguese Court did not, however, return to Lisbon till 1821, when John VI. reoccupied its throne, leaving his son Pedro on the throne of Brazil, which became a distinct sovereignty.

On the death of John, Maria, the daughter of the emperor of Brazil, was, in acknowledgment of his right, proclaimed queen; but Don Miguel, another son of John, who had risen against him during the latter part of his reign and was put down, again came forward, and dismissing the Cortes, got himself proclaimed absolute king. The cause of Maria was thereupon vigorously taken up by her father, the emperor of Brazil, who, coming over in person, succeeded in deposing Miguel, and in restoring his daughter to her throne. For a long period after, however, the peace of Portugal was disturbed by the obstinacy and caprices of the young queen, which soon lost her the affections of her people. She was only able to retain the crown by agreeing to a new constitution framed in 1838, in compliance with the popular demand. Her successor, Louis I., ascended the throne in 1861.

The government of Portugal is a hereditary monarchy, aided by a Cortes; but the people are ignorant and bigoted, and the nobility not more enlightened, and they are both equally unfit to appreciate an administration that is really free. Correct and liberal views of policy are entertained by a small section—the educated portion of the middle class, who have, however, no power to enforce any change against the feelings of the multitude. The religion of Portugal is Catholicism. In letters she has made no name; but she gave birth to Camoens.

Italy.

Of Italy we shall not attempt to say much. The dissolution of the Roman empire was an event of ancient history, and has been previously noticed. The reconquest of Italy for Justinian was accomplished by Belisarius and Narses, the latter of whom, having defeated the Ostrogoths, governed the country in the name of the emperor, till, becoming disgusted with the treatment he received from him, he sold the kingdom to the Lombards, in 568. The country was thereupon inundated by the invaders, who established themselves easily in every part of it except Ravenna and Rome, which continued to be held for the Byzantine emperor, the former by his exarch or governor, and the latter by the Bishop of Rome. In the course of time Ravenna was reduced; but, Rome, though frequently menaced, still held out, and was once saved by the intervention of Pepin, and again by that of Charlemagne, by whom the kingdom of Lombardy was overturned.

The authority of the pontiffs in Italy dates thus from the days of Pepin, by whom the city and surrounding country were given to the Pope, who, previous to that time, had acted simply as a local bishop, subject to the emperor at Constantinople. The breach between the popes and the emperors began after this to widen; and in 782, Pope Gregory II., being dissatisfied with certain orders of the emperor Leo regarding the worship of images, threw off his dependence on him, and, founding his power on the choice of the people, arrogated sacerdotal dominion over all Europe, and soon came to be acknowledged as the head of the Church. The virtues of many of the first popes rendered them worthy of the authority thus exercised, and some such authority was certainly necessary at that age for the propagation of the Gospel.

The descendants of Charlemagne were not able to retain their supremacy in Italy long; and the great vassals of the empire succeeded, therefore, in making themselves virtually independent. Of these the principal were the dukes of

Benevento, Tuscany, and Spoleto, the marquises of Ivrea, Susa, and Friuli, and the princes of Salerno and Capua—besides whom, the catapan of the Eastern emperors governed Apulia and Calabria, his authority being also acknowledged by the republics of Amalfi and Naples, while the Pope ruled over the turbulent people of Rome. The contentions among these for supreme authority were frequent, and, when Berenger II. of Ivrea nearly succeeded in attaining it, the other competitors invited the aid of Otho the Great of Germany, and the German monarchs thenceforth became the kings of Italy.

In the eleventh century the Normans invaded Italy and conquered Apulia, Calabria, and the island of Sicily, and the confusion created thereby helped much to augment the pretensions of the popes. The ignominy to which Henry IV. of Germany was obliged to submit has been noticed already; and it has also been stated that his son, Henry V., was obliged to renounce the right of investing bishops with the ring and the crosier, being only allowed to confer temporalities on them by the sceptre. What still kept open the quarrel between the two parties was, that the election of the pope required the emperor's confirmation, and the election of the emperor the consecration of the Vatican—the first having been assumed as an imperial, and the second as a spiritual privilege, both from the time of Charlemagne.

In the twelfth century several free-cities arose in power in Italy, and established an independent and republican form of government, the chief of them being Milan, Pavia, Verona, Padua, Pisa, Florence, Genoa, and Venice; and as these took up warmly the perpetual disputes which were raging between the emperors and the popes, their mutual wars and animosities were incessant. At last the dispute with the emperors was ended by the edict of Frankfort denying the right of the pope to interfere in imperial elections; and, in the same vein, the popes, from the time of Gregory VII., never condescended to seek for imperial confirmation. The superiority of the papal over the royal

power. By in this, that the arms employed by the Pontiff were excommunication and interdict, the operation of which on the minds of the superstitious was unfailing, to which the temporal arms of the emperors could offer no sufficient resistance.

In the thirteenth century the republics in Italy were numerous and independent; and several of them rose to great opulence and power. But most of these were soon after reduced under the rule of their *signora*, or tyrants, and began rapidly to decline; while Genoa and Venice, which retained their republican form, continued in their career of industry and greatness, carrying on an extensive and lucrative commerce, which was only diverted from them on the discovery of an easier passage to the East round the Cape of Good Hope.

In the fourteenth century the Christian world was scandalized by the appearance of three or four rival popes at one and the same time, and their quarrels with each other, which were terminated by the deposal of all the candidates by the Council of Pisa, and the election of a new pope—Martin V.—in 1414. These unseemly disturbances contributed much to lower the influence of the popes; the dissolute lives of the clergy also gave great offence; and the general education of the people contributed at the same time to lessen the fears of excommunications and interdicts: all which circumstances prepared silently the way for the Reformation.

In the sixteenth century the greater part of Italy became subject to Charles V., as king of Spain, after a protracted quarrel with France, which claimed several portions of it as fiefs of the Holy See, while the claim of Spain was based on inheritance from local sovereigns by female descent. From this period Italy began to languish; the trade of Venice and Genoa fell off, and most of the cities came to be governed by officers of German and Spanish origin, or by princes connected with the houses of Austria and Bourbon. She had no disturbances now to dread; but her ancient spirit had declined, and she sank fast in

luxury, occupied in the enjoyment of her arts and natural advantages.

At the outbreak of the French Revolution the principal divisions of Italy were the principality of Savoy, the papedom, the republics of Genoa and Venice, the grand-duchy of Tuscany, and the small principalities of Parma and Modena. Naples and Sicily were governed by a king of the Bourbon line, while Mantua, Milan, and other places were in the possession of Austria. The French, under Bonaparte, invaded Italy in 1796, upon which the Austrians, being defeated, were obliged to relinquish their possessions. On a renewal of the war in 1799, the Austrians, assisted by the Russians, were able to recover a great part of what had belonged to them, but were again deprived of them after the battle of Marengo. In 1805, Bonaparte was crowned king of the country, and Joseph and Murat were successively made king of Naples, while the pope, deprived of his temporal sovereignty, was conveyed to Paris.

On the downfall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna effected a re-division of the country, by which the papal territories were restored to the pope, and Naples and Sicily to their former king; Piedmont and Genoa, being united, were given to the king of Sardinia as the representative of the dukes of Savoy; and the rest of Italy, including Venice, was absorbed by Austria. But this arrangement did not satisfy the Italian states: it was no longer suited to the wants and genius of the people, who were all more or less in favour of an independent existence. Their impatience of a foreign yoke increased daily, and the unconciliating spirit in which Austria resumed her possessions revived the antipathy against her. In 1830, an Italian revolution was planned at Paris, which died out on receiving no support from the government of Louis Philippe; but in Italy itself the efforts of Mazzini continued gradually to strengthen the nucleus of discontent, and, in 1848, Charles Albert commenced the war of liberty and regeneration. He was defeated at Novara; but the people expelled the pope, and declared a republic, which, in its turn, was upset by the

French, who re-established the pope, and left a garrison of twenty thousand French troops in Italy for his protection. It was reserved for Napoleon III. to take up the right side of the contest; and on the fields of Magenta and Solferino the dream of a united Italy was realized. The constitution of Italy now is the best in Europe set up on the model of the English, and is about the closest imitation of it. The executive power of the state belongs exclusively to the sovereign; while the legislative power is vested in the king and parliament, the latter consisting of two chambers, namely, the senate and a chamber of deputies. Unlike other nations of the continent, the people of Italy have really a potential voice in the administration of their country. But the power of the state has not yet been fully consolidated, and much more of fighting may still be necessary to secure that end, for which she is at this moment fully armed.

The name of Italy is dear to every reader of history, not only for the greatness of ancient Rome, but also for the part she has taken in the revival of letters and arts in Europe. Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Ariosto, and Tasso, are names that will not easily be forgotten. Machiavelli and Guicciardini, as historians; Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Titian, and Michael Angelo, as painters; Galileo, as astronomer; and Lorenzo de Medici and Pope Leo X., as munificent patrons of arts and artists, learning and learned men, will also long be remembered. But in later times the political condition of the country has not been equally favourable to intellectual development, and what Italy is now best known for are her musicians and opera-singers!

Turkey.

Turkey completes the rôle of European states that remained to be named. She is so called after the Turks, formerly a fierce people, though they have become quite emasculated in modern times. The origin of the race was in the centre of Asia, where they worked in the iron-mines

of the Altai under the Geugens or Tartars, till a bold leader (Bertezená) arose among them, and instructed them to make swords for themselves and achieve their freedom. Proceeding from the Altai, they inundated the countries to the west, and formed their first independent stronghold in the steppes still called Turkestan. The Arabs came in contact with them when, after overthrowing the Persian kingdom, they penetrated into the countries of the Oxus and the Jaxartes, for propagating the doctrines of Mahomet; and, finding the Turks to be possessed of as much strength and valour as they themselves were distinguished for, they took large bodies of them into their service, as guards for their kaliphs, by whom many coveted advantages were conferred on them, to attach them more firmly to their interests. The faithfulness of the Turks, however, was but indifferently secured. The body-guards in time became insolent, while the favourites selected out of them and appointed governors of provinces declared their independence; and when the dynasty of the Abbásides was overthrown, the Turkish power arose upon the ruins of the Saracenic empire.*

The Samanian dynasty was the first to succeed the Abbásides, and was, in its turn, displaced by the Seljukian dynasty. When the power of the Seljuks was subverted by the Moguls, the Turks formed several independent principalities of their own, among which was a settlement in Armenia, formed by a leader named Ortogrul. The son of Ortogrul was Othmán, who, on being elected chief of the Oguzian Turks, proceeded in the direction of Phrygia, and taking Brusa from the Greek empire, laid the foundation of the Ottoman power. He accepted the Mahomedan religion, and proclaiming that he had a divine mission to propagate it, excited the fanaticism and valour of his troops, and obtained from them a blind and implicit obedience. He was thus able to subdue a large portion of Lesser Asia, and consolidated his conquests by great bounty and liberality to his men of war and to the poor; and his son Orchán, following in his footsteps, added considerably to his territories,

beside forming a strong force, known as the Janizaries (*Ján-nissárás*, or Life Guards), which did good service in his day, although it subsequently became very famous for revolts.

Amurath, the successor of Orchán, was first obliged to put down a combination of the Mahomedan princes of Asia against him; after which he turned his arms against Europe, and having passed over to Gallipoli with a powerful army, seized upon several important places in Thrace, terminating a series of victories by the reduction of Adrianople, to which the seat of his government was removed. The rapid decline of the Greek empire at this time subjected it to successive losses of territory, till the imperial power was fairly confined to the city of Constantinople and a part of Thrace and Bulgaria. But Amurath met with considerable opposition from a formidable confederacy of the Slav tribes, which made a resolute stand against the common enemy, till, after a terrible conflict, it was completely overthrown.

A fierce and remorseless warrior, Bajázet, who well merited the surname of *Illderim*, or the Lightning, assumed by him, succeeded Amurath, and defeated a Christian army of sixty thousand men reinforced by the noblest chivalry of Germany and France, and commanded by one of the greatest generals of the age—Sigismund, king of Hungary. But his Asiatic dominions being shortly after invaded by Timour-lung, the Mogul, at the head of eight hundred-thousand men, Bajázet was defeated in his turn, and subjected to a cruel and humiliating bondage which he did not long survive; and this interrupted the progress of the Ottoman power in Europe for the time, giving a respite to the Greek empire, which continued to hold on for half a century longer.

For ten years after the death of Bajázet, the Ottoman empire was distracted by the pretensions of rival competitors for the throne, till it was assumed by Mahomed I., the youngest son of Bajázet, who consolidated his father's conquests, and successfully established his authority both in Europe and Asia, for which he was proclaimed to be the

second founder of the empire. Amurath II., his son, inherited all the valour of his race; and the Greek emperor, having set up a pretender to the throne, he proceeded against him, subdued a large portion of the Byzantine territory, and defeated the Hungarians in a great battle at Varna. His successor, Mahomed II., pursuing the same course, besieged and captured Constantinople, which filled all Europe with consternation; and ever since that city has remained the capital of the Ottoman empire.

Bajázet II. was killed by his son Selim I. The history of Turkey is so full of horrors of this nature that we cannot stop to notice them. As a ruler Selim signalized himself by adding Syria and Egypt to the empire, whereby he also derived from the last of the kaliphs the influence and authority which they had exercised over the followers of the Prophet. His son, Solymán the Magnificent, repeatedly defeated the Hungarians and the Germans, acquiring several important places from them. He also took Rhodes from the Knights of St. John, and otherwise obtained possession of most of the islands in the Mediterranean, of the towns of Tunis and Bisertá in Africa, and of Bagdad. The island of Cyprus was reduced by his son Selim II., with whom accession of territory was closed. The fleet of Selim was destroyed at Lepanto by the combined fleets of Venice and Spain; and the princes who succeeded him were not able to repair the loss, being only known to fame for their murders and debaucheries within the *hárem*, and for an imbecility which made the Janizaries insubordinate, and led to perpetual rebellions.

Under Mahomed IV. the power of Turkey became again for a moment formidable to Europe, chiefly from the abilities of his vizier, Achmet Kiuprili, one of the ablest statesmen that Turkey, or Europe, has ever known. He took Candia from the Venetians, and made some conquests also from the Germans, Hungarians, and Poles. But fortune veered back with his death, and Sobieski, king of Poland, compelled the Turks, in 1683, to raise the siege of Vienna, and in 1687 they suffered another severe defeat in Hun-

gary, which led to the deposition of Mahomed IV. After this, the power of Turkey rapidly declined; and, in 1699, she had to cede Transylvania to Austria, Azof to Russia, and Morea to the Venetians, the last of which was subsequently recovered.

The reign of Achmet III. was the era of the conflict of Charles XII. of Sweden with Peter the Great; and Achmet having given an asylum to the former after his defeat at Pultowa, was drawn into a war with Russia in which Peter was worsted, he being only rescued from danger, as has been related in the preceding chapter, by the treaty of Pruth, which was negotiated by the impromptu diplomacy of his wife. Achmet was less successful in a war with Austria, by which he was compelled to relinquish Belgrade; and, being also defeated by Nádir Sháh in Persia, the Janizaries rose up against him and deposed him. In the reigns which followed, the wars between Russia and Turkey were frequently repeated, and the latter was gradually compelled to relinquish all her possessions on the north coast of the Black Sea. Russia also assumed the right to protect the Christian princes of Moldavia and Wallachia; and on the Persian frontier Georgia and Armenia were lost.

There was no renovation for Turkey in subsequent years. In the reign of Selim III. peace with Russia was purchased by great sacrifices of territory, and Egypt was invaded by the French, who had to be expelled from it by the English. In that of Máhmood II. the Greeks fought for their independence, and secured it in 1828, after the destruction of the Ottoman fleet by a combined action on the part of Britain, France, and Russia. Later, a war with Russia broke out, in which the Turkish armies were uniformly defeated, and large concessions had to be made to prevent the occupation of Constantinople. On the other hand, Máhmood was able to carry out military reforms within the empire, by which the power of the Janizaries was broken; and many other changes were effected which facilitated the acquisition of European civilisation by his people.

The last years of Máhmood II. were disturbed by the defection of Egypt, where the viceroy, Mehemet Áli, aspired to independent sovereignty. The dispute was terminated in the reign of Abdool Mejid, under the terms of a convention signed in London between England, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, by which the hereditary *páshalic* of Egypt was secured to the family of Mehemet Áli in subordination to the Porte. The tranquillity which followed this settlement was soon after disturbed by the desire of Russia to hasten the dissolution of the Turkish empire, on the pretext that some interference was necessary on behalf of its Christian population. This brought on the war of 1854, from which Turkey came out unscathed, on account of the support given to her by France, England, and Sardinia.

It must be conceded, however, that the sick man is really sick, and so sick as to be almost beyond all reasonable hopes of recovery. The vigour which led to the establishment of the empire has long ceased to exist. All the present strength of Turkey consists in the maintenance of armies and fleets commanded by European officers, but from which no lasting benefit can be derived in the absence of a strong backbone to rest upon. The government of the country is still an absolute despotism, which the influence of European civilisation has not modified to any considerable extent. Its religion is Mahomedanism according to the Sooni doctrines, and is yet bigotedly adhered to; and the fundamental laws of the empire are based on the Korán. Some reforms have certainly been made in the political organization of the state; but they have given it no vitality. No progress whatever has been made in the country in literature, the sciences, and the arts. The Russian *dictum* is therefore undoubtedly correct, that the existence of Turkey in Europe at this hour is an anomaly which ought to be rectified. The war of 1877 had almost effected this rectification after the manner desired by Russia. The end has been staved off for a time, but it is not the less certain to come.

CHAPTER IX.

THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF ASIA, AFRICA,
AND AMERICA.

THE principal states of Asia, Africa, and America, other than those which we have noticed in the preceding chapters, now require to be mentioned.

China.

Commencing with the states in Asia, we first notice China, a country of the ancient world which has prolonged its existence to the present day. The territory appertaining to it is only inferior in geographical extent to that owned by Russia in Asia, while, on the other hand, it is much more productive and more thickly populated. Over a considerable portion of it, however, the supremacy of China is merely nominal, several places in Tartary being virtually independent, as also is Thibet.

The modern history of China commences properly with the conquest of the country by the successors of Chingez Khán, previous to which period it was not much known to the nations of the West, except by doubtful report. In the thirteenth century it was visited by Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller, who repaired to it through Turkestan, and took service under Kublai Khán, the greatest monarch of his day. The first European nation to visit it by sea were the Portuguese, and Xavier sailed for it with the benevolent intention of converting it to Christianity, but died while off the coast, in 1552. In the commencement of the seventeenth century several Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Capuchins entered the country, and at first their success in conversion was not inconsiderable, though the heart of the country was not then, as it is not

even now, accessible to foreigners. All the attempts of the British government to open intercourse with China have been made mainly in connection with the opium-trade; and only recently, after much fighting and negotiation, have some twenty-four ports been opened to European traffic, and access given to Peking.

The population of China proper is estimated at above four hundred-millions, and has from time immemorial enjoyed a name for diligence. The cultivation of the earth is particularly prized, but no branch of art or industry is neglected. The consequence is that China produces everything that she requires for her own use; and it is well-known that her manufactures are not much, if at all, inferior to those produced in Europe. In the construction and use of firearms, in printing and engraving, in the manufacture of silk, cotton-cloths, and earthenware, the Chinese have always taken the lead; and in the three last they do not yield the palm of superiority even now to any nation. But, unfortunately, Chinese civilisation is, or rather has hitherto been, stereotyped, and this has operated as a great bar to improvement. Set anything before a Chinese workman, and he will readily produce its exact duplicate, although the tools he uses are few and clumsy as compared with those used by European artificers. There is no reason therefore why China should not be able to follow in the wake of the nations of Europe if she chooses to do so. What China is now best known to European nations for is her tea, which, grown elsewhere, never acquires the same flavour and quality.

The condition of the Chinese people is very low, because the despotism which governs them is very rigid. The power of the emperor is supreme, superior even to the laws. He is also the sole proprietor of the soil, which is let out to landholders, and through them underlet to tenants. In former times the government was patriarchal; but that phase of it has long disappeared, every sort of oppression having since been gradually introduced. The mandarins, imitating the sovereign, are extremely tyrannical, and

arrogates as much power under him as he arrogates over them; and the example is followed step by step to the lowest grade of officialism. The general religion of the country is Buddhism; but it has been correctly asserted that the worship of the emperor is the real religion of his subjects. All this accounts for the present excessive demoralization of the people; but there is nevertheless no doubt that China is yet the strongest power in Asia, England and Russia excepted. She has now an army either commanded or guided by European officers, and armed with European rifles; has conquered the Panthays, or Mussulman insurgents on the south-west; is planning the conquest of Yárkand as a revolted province; and every now and then threatens a demonstration in the direction of Nepál, and is not unanxious to measure swords with Cashmere. In the arts of peace her superiority is still more marked and decisive. She anticipated Europe in many of the most important inventions, and the progress she made she has retained. Her conservatism also has since commenced to die out, for railways and telegraph cables have begun to be appreciated; and this promises a still further advance for her in the future.

Japan.

The next state to notice is the island empire of Japan, or Zipangu, supposed by some authorities to be an offshoot of China, and by others of Tartary, which was first brought to the notice of Europe by Marco Polo. The annals of the country fix the foundation of its monarchy at some seven hundred years before the Christian era. The government is hereditary and theocratical, the emperor or *Mikado* being both king and high-priest. The offices were separated in the sixteenth century, in the reign of Taiko Sama, who took to himself the title of *Koboe*, or lay emperor; and, for a long time after, Japan continued to have two emperors at one and the same time—namely, the *Mikado*, or ecclesiastical emperor, and the *Tycoon*, or secular emperor—the

power of the second being subordinate to that of the first. In general acceptance the *Tycoon* was regarded as the *Mikado's* lieutenant, though actually he often exercised paramount authority, as most of the *Mikados* passed their lives in idleness and seclusion, with concubines and flatterers. More recently the second post has been abolished, and the *Mikado* has at the same time thrown aside his seclusion and indifference.

The Portuguese opened European intercourse with Japan by visiting it in 1542, and Xavier went to it eight years after. In 1600, a Dutch vessel was wrecked on the coast of one of the islands, on board of which was an Englishman named Adams, the first of his nation who landed in that country. He rose into great favour with the emperor, and invited first the Dutch and afterwards the English merchants to visit it. But the prospects of the Christians there were shortly after spoilt by the Portuguese, by an attempt they made in concert with the Japanese Christians to overturn the native empire and establish a Christian dynasty. An atrocious massacre of all Christians was the punishment meted out for the crime, and this was followed by a proclamation that no followers of that faith were thenceforth to be allowed to land in Japan, which the Dutch evaded by boldly asserting that they were Dutchmen, and not Christians, which in that age was very near to the truth.

In 1811, the English took forcible possession of Java, Sumatra, and the other Dutch possessions in the East; but it was not till many years after that any attempt was made to reopen communication with Japan. An opportunity to do this was afforded in 1831, when a junk was blown off the coast into the Pacific Ocean, and, after drifting for a long time, was cast ashore in America at the mouth of the Columbia river, where the crew were taken care of by some Englishmen and Americans. To carry these people back to their country was the pretext on which an attempt to renew intercourse was made; but the advances were repulsed, and the vessel, refused admittance into Japanese

water, was obliged to fall back to Macáo. The persistence of the English and the Americans in their endeavours to secure a friendly intercourse with the country were eventually successful; and, since 1854, amicable treaties have been entered into under which, as in the case of China, several of the Japanese ports have been made accessible to the treaty powers. Free intercourse between foreigners and the natives has not even now been attained; but it is expected that shortly it will be.

The Japanese are decidedly the most forward nation in Asia, being more in advance than the Chinese. Their whole country has been revolutionized since the opening of communication with foreigners, whom they now imitate in almost everything. The government is, of course, still an absolute despotism, but one in which the despot is subject to a system of unchanging laws, besides which he has of late imposed many restrictions on himself in imitation of European states. He has his council and secretaries to assist him in giving effect to the laws; and for the government of the country at large he has vassal-princes under him, each over a specified jurisdiction and having his minister and secretary to assist him. The people, as is the case all over the East, have no rights or privileges, but they are full of new aspirations and ideas, which must in time fructify to their advantage. All classes are also very industrious, and for a long time there has been a fair share of civilisation and refinement even among the poorest. From the highest to the lowest every Japanese is sent to school; and it is said that there are more schools in the empire now than in any other country in the world, and that they have all been recently reorganized on the European model. The condition of women, which some consider to be the best test of civilisation, is also better in Japan than in any other Asiatic country.

Burmáh.

Of the independent states between India and China, the principal are Burmáh and Siam. The old history of

Burmáh is full of civil dissensions between the Burmese and the Peguans, which were very sanguinary. In 1750-52, the latter, with the assistance of the Portuguese, captured Ává, and annexed Burmáh to Pegu. But this triumph was short-lived. The royal family of Burmáh being unable to maintain the contest, it was warmly taken up by an adventurer—Alompraw—who, having defeated the Peguans, assumed the throne. He also took summary vengeance on the English and the French, who had established factories in Burmáh, and always interfered in her civil feuds with a view to secure their own ends; and this ill-faith of the foreigners was long remembered against them in the country, in which they were refused a footing.

In 1767, Burmáh was invaded by a Chinese army of fifty thousand men; but the reigning king, Shempuan, was vigorous, and gave it such reception that not a man of the whole force ever returned to China. In 1794, a Burmese army of five thousand men crossed the British frontier and entered the district of Chittagong in pursuit of some refugees from Arracan, but retreated on being told to do so, when the delinquents were given up. This opened an intercourse between the English and the Burmese, which often became irritating on account of the constant flight of refugees from an ill-governed country, till at last war broke out between the two governments, in 1824. The ostensible grounds of the war were disturbances in Cáchár, the throne of which was contested—one claimant being upheld by the English, and the other by the king of Burmáh. The Burmese fought well, at least the English generals said so—a common claptrap on the part of victors to secure greater praise to themselves. The war was terminated by the acquisition of Arracan by the British government, the Burmese being at the same time expelled from Assam and Cáchár. This was the origin of British Burmáh, which is now governed by a British Chief-Commissioner.

The government of Burmáh is despotic; but the despotism is not unlimited, being subject to the influence of the priests. No king dares to treat the sacerdotal class

with disrespect, as that would at once lead to the subversion of his throne. The rest of the people are of no account; but Mrs. Judson describes them as being lively, industrious, and energetic, and more advanced in civilisation than other eastern nations generally. The religion of the country is Buddhism; and of course caste, the great bugbear of India, is unknown. The country having now been fairly laid open, there is every chance of its gradual improvement, as it is not an old and effete state, nor too proud to learn.

Siam.

Like Burmah, Siam also was at the outset constantly involved in wars with Pegu. In the seventeenth century it had the misfortune to have a Christian—a Venetian nobleman named Phaulcon—for prime-minister, who concerted with the French the conversion of the king and the establishment of a Gallic-Indian empire in the East. But the Siamese nobles discovered the plot and defeated it, the minister being killed and the French expelled the country; and, as the king had been partial to his minister, the royal dynasty was changed. In 1821, steps were taken by the British government to open a friendly intercourse with Siam; but the special mission despatched for that purpose was unsuccessful. Greater success was obtained on the acquisition of British Burmah, when the British and Siamese frontiers came to coalesce; and the intercourse thus opened has been so well cultivated that the present king of Siam visited the late Lord Mayo at Calcutta, a few years ago. His government is despotic, but more liberal than that of Burmah, a great share of political authority being vested in a number of hereditary chieftains, who are owners of the land. The king has besides a deputy, who is called the second king, and also a state-council and a privy-council, a government gazette, and an official newspaper for the publication of articles on arts, sciences, and literature. The institutions of Europe are now being largely imitated in all parts of the world, but unfortunately without being really appreciated.

Persia.

Passing over India, which we have already noticed, we come to Persia, the modern history of which commences with its conquest by the Arabian kaliphs, in 641, when all that was useful, grand, or sacred in that country was destroyed. A great portion of the conquered inhabitants in submitting to their new masters adopted the religion propagated by them, as affording the only means of securing equal rights with their conquerors; while the rest, self-banished, preserved their religion and manners in foreign lands. These latter are the *Pársees*, the largest number of whom are located in the Bombay Presidency, in India. Their country was held by the kaliphs for more than two centuries, the history of which period is represented mainly by petty revolts. Its possession was afterwards usurped by a leader of banditti—Yacoob-Ben-Leis, and then by the families of Samáni and Dilemi, between whom the royal power was divided. These were succeeded by the Seljuks, of whom the greatest was Alp Árselan, the victor of Romanus Diogenes, the husband of the Empress Eudoxia. The tomb of Alp Árselan is at Merv, and bears the following motto: "Oh ye, who have seen the glory of Alp Árselan exalted to the heavens, repair to Merv and behold it buried in the dust!" The glory thus vaunted of was confined to military conquests only.

In the thirteenth century Persia was conquered by Haláku, a grandson of Chingez Khán, who captured and demolished Bagdád, and put to death the last kaliph of the house of Abbás. It was during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that the most celebrated authors of Persia flourished; but this was also the period of the greatest distraction in the state, which was only terminated by the conquest of the country by Timour-lung, in 1384. The fourth son of Timour, Sháh Rokh, was a distinguished patron of letters, as also was his son Ulugh Beg; but the supremacy of the family was of short continuance. In

1502, the Sháh Ishmail made himself master of Persia, and founded the Suffanean dynasty, the greatest ornament of which was Sháh Abbás, who was severe to his ministers and nobles, and barbarously cruel to his own family, but who promoted commerce, countenanced Christianity, and patronised literature and the arts. In 1722, the Afgháns under Máhmood conquered Persia, but were soon expelled by Nádir—the general of Tamásp, the rightful king—who also defeated the Russians and the Turks. Nádir was himself proclaimed king by the nobles in 1736, and greatly augmented the consequence of Persia by his conquests. But the affairs of the country fell again into confusion upon his being assassinated, and Ahmed Sháh Dooráni took that opportunity to establish a separate independent kingdom in Kabool. Since then the prestige of Persia has been still further reduced by her wars with Russia, by whom she has been dispossessed of all the provinces between the Black and Caspian Seas.

The distractions of Persia, and its perpetual conquest by foreign invaders, have reduced the greatest empire of the ancient world to the extreme of weakness and imbecility. It now lies quite at the mercy of the Russians, who can occupy it whenever they choose to do so. In all other respects the Persians may be, as they are described to be, the same as they were in the days of Darius and Noshirwán the Just; but their old martial character has become extinct, and fifty thousand Cossacks would now march through the country unopposed from one extremity to another, provided no European power came forward to interfere. Nádir Sháh defeated the combined armies of Russia and Turkey in 1722; in 1922 it is doubtful if Persia will remain a distinct state. The government of the country is an absolute monarchy; but there is a certain amount of self-government in the towns and villages, which choose their own judges and magistrates. The people are distinguished from other oriental races by education, a superior civilisation, and grosser morals. But altogether their sub-

jection to Russia would not be a disadvantage either to themselves or to their neighbours.

Arabia.

Arabia completes the Asiatic states that required to be mentioned. Its modern history opens with the advent of Mahomet for the high purpose of bringing the pagan Arabs to a knowledge of God. "The injustice of Meccá, and the choice of Mediná," as Gibbon expresses it, "transformed the citizen into a prince, and the preacher into a leader of armies." The religion he preached was also purer than the Christianity of the age, and thus came to be rapidly and extensively propagated; and, as every country that accepted it accepted also the sovereignty of the kaliphs, the Arabian empire under the last of the Ommyyades extended from the confines of Tartary and India on one side to the shores of the Atlantic on the other.

This extent of the empire, however, led to the consequence of Arabia itself being much impaired. On the general massacre of the Ommyyades, the thrones of Egypt, Western Africa, and Spain became independent; while the seat of government of the remainder being established at Bagdád, Arabia was reduced to the rank of a province of the empire. In 1258, the metropolis of Islámism fell into the hands of Haláku, the grandson of Chingez; and, the last of the kaliphs being murdered by him, Arabia reverted to its former state of anarchy and confusion, being subdivided once more into a number of petty principalities ruled over by their respective *Sheiks* and *Emirs*.

In the eighteenth century an attempt to reunite the nations was made by a new prophet named Abdool Wáhab, who appeared in the province of Najd, and proclaimed his mission to be to correct the abuses which had crept into the Mahomedan religion, particularly in respect to the worship of saints and the use of spirituous liquors. His doctrines were widely propagated among the tribes of the East—so much so that the British government in the centre of India had to watch over the Wáhabee movement that disturbed

its repose. In Arabia itself, however, many of the *Sheiks* refused to accept the innovations offered, which were also rejected by the holy cities of Meccá and Mediná; and, though they yet remain very powerful, universal dominion over all Arabia, which they aspired to, was never acquired by the Wáhabees. The general sovereignty over Arabia is now claimed by the Páshá of Egypt on behalf of the Sultán of Turkey: but there are several chiefs scattered over the peninsula who are entirely independent; and the Bedouins remain unsubdued and unchangeable, hostile towards everybody crossing their path, and only momentarily amenable to authority when strongly backed by arms. These have never been civilised, and probably never will be. They live in tents, and move about from place to place, each family owning only a few sheep, goats, and horses, wherewith to support themselves. For the most part they live by plunder, and yet they are all highly contemplative, and religiously inclined. Of Arabia generally it may be correctly said, that, towards the end of the nineteenth century, it is in as barbarous a condition as any portion of the world; notwithstanding that the Arabs, in their days of greatness, contributed much to the civilisation of Europe.

The African States.

Very little can be said of the states of Africa, because very little is known of them. The chief divisions of the country are: (1) Moorish Africa, or the coast-land of the north; (2) Sahara, or the sandy desert; (3) the Nile districts, including Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia; (4) Negroland, East; (5) Negroland, West; (6) the Upper Western Coast; (7) the Lower Western Coast; (8) Southern Africa, including the Cape Colony; (9) the Eastern Coast, including Mozambique, Zanzibar, the island of Madagascar, &c.; and (10) the unexplored regions between the lower western coast and the eastern coast. Of these, the first and third divisions only have been well-explored: the former as being nearest to Europe, to which it seeks to be attached; the latter as the theatre of the vigorous researches which

have been prosecuted of late throughout the entire region of the Nile. As to the rest, very small portions of them only have yet been opened out, and it will probably take an immense long time to develop even those portions fully.

In a general way the continent may be divided into two main divisions—namely, the portions north and south of the Kong mountains and the *Jebal al Komar*, which give rise to the Senegal and the Niger, and were long believed to give rise also to the Nile. All the countries to the north of this line are still ruled and partially occupied by foreign races of Arab descent, who took possession of them in remote times, driving the aboriginal population to the mountains and deserts in the interior. The countries to the south of the line are entirely peopled by the negro race, the extreme south only having been partially colonised by the English. The tribes scattered over such a vast extent of territory are of course very dissimilar to each other in their peculiarities. The habits of all of them are equally simple, but their characters vary between the extremes of mildness and ferocity, and they are so isolated from each other that they rarely come together except to fight. Towards the eastern coast the Negro features change for those of the Caffré race, and towards the south for those of the Betjouná and Hottentot races.

The west coast, which is Negroland throughout, was the first to come into European notice, the Portuguese having established themselves in it in connection with their earliest maritime discoveries. The success of Diaz in doubling the Cape subsequently diverted the energies of his countrymen to another sphere, upon which the work of African exploration was taken up by the English. But all the good which was done to Africa had reference only to the advance of geographical knowledge. No attempts were made by either the Portuguese or the English to civilise the inhabitants. Of course converts to Christianity were made, which testifies only to the irrepressibleness of the missionary character.

Many of the races which have been converted eat their dead mothers up to this day !

In connection with recent events, the Gold Coast, Ashantee, and Zanzibar have come into prominence; but there is nothing especial about them as distinguished from other places. There is no doubt that Africa has a future; but, with England struggling at one extremity and France at another, it will be very slow work to develop her fully if the other European powers do not take part in the work. Why does not Germany, which has so much redundant energy to spare, seek an outlet for it near the equator, and annex the Negroland? If Mr. Donald Mackenzie's plan of converting the desert of Sahara into an inland sea, by letting in the waters of the Atlantic, can ever be carried out, the interior of Africa will not remain so unhealthy as it is at present.

Mexico.

The states in America requiring to be noticed are: the more important of the republics which sprang into existence on the dissolution of the Spanish monarchy, and the empire of Brazil, which had belonged to the Portuguese. The Spanish dominions in America at one time surpassed in extent the territorial possessions of Great Britain and Russia. They consisted of Mexico, Guatemala, Porto Rico, and Cuba, in North America; and New Granada, Peru, Buenos Ayres, Caraccas, and Chili, in South America. Of these, Mexico conquered by Cortez, Peru by Pizarro, and Chili by Almagro, were the most important. The first invader on the field was Cortez, who landed in America in 1519, with five hundred and eight soldiers and one hundred and nine seamen and artificers. The natives, instead of opposing their entrance into the country, facilitated it in every way, till they got alarmed by the discharge of their fire-arms, after which all attempts to get an interview with Montezuma, their king, were discouraged.

The first settlement established by Cortez was at Vera

Cruz. He increased his power by an alliance with the chief of a disaffected Mexican town, and prevented the defection of his own followers by the voluntary destruction of his little fleet, by which all hopes of retreat were cut off. A forced interview with the king, and his violent seizure and retention as a prisoner, made Cortez the ruler of the empire in Montezuma's name, till an attempt to overthrow the religion of the Mexicans roused them to revolt. The struggles that followed do not require to be noticed in detail. The Spaniards were strengthened by the addition of a hostile armament sent against Cortez from Cuba, which was first defeated and then bought over; and Montezuma dying a prisoner, and his second successor, Guatimozin, being put to death, all Mexico submitted to the victor, and was annexed to Castile. The achievements of Cortez were, however, not successful in securing the confidence and favour of his sovereign. A new viceroy was appointed to supplant him in Mexico; and, on his return to Spain, the only consolation left to him was the immense fortune he had amassed, which he was permitted to retain.

The vastness of the enterprise undertaken by Cortez, and the boldness by which it was carried out, palliated to some extent the lawlessness of his proceedings, and the atrocities by which they were accompanied. After him the colonial history of Mexico has nothing particular to interest the general reader. From 1535 to 1808 Mexico continued to be governed by viceroys sent out from Spain, and the whole country was easily converted to Catholicism. The government was very dissimilar in character to that adopted in the English colonies when they sprang up. The Spanish possessions were not colonies, but distinct kingdoms held in fief by the Crown under a grant from the Pope. The people who went to settle in them took out few or no women from Europe, but formed connections with the wives and daughters of those they conquered. A large Creole population was thus gradually formed, which soon rose into importance. In 1810, the invasion of Spain by Napoleon I. caused a revolution in Mexico, the natives of which fought

stoutly for liberation. The insurrection was headed by Spaniards, while the Creoles were equally divided on both sides. The royalists proved successful on the occasion, and treated the patriots who were defeated with great severity. People who are constantly speaking of the Black Hole of Calcuttá and the atrocities of Soorájá Dowláh, should read the accounts of the dungeons of San Juan de Ullua, where the sentinels on duty frequently fainted from the horrid effluvia issuing from them.

A second revolutionary movement broke out in 1821, and was concluded successfully in 1824. A republican form of government was now established quite independent of Spain, and every inhabitant of Mexico—Spaniard, Creole, or American—was declared to have equal rights. This declaration of independence excited much admiration at the time; but the result has not justified the expectations that were then formed. The Mexicans have not proved themselves to be worthy of their independence. Their irregularities gave rise to several disagreements with European states. In the time of Napoleon III. an endeavour was made to force on them a sovereign selected by France; but the United States objected to the interference, and the French being worsted, their nominee was captured and murdered. By the terms of its constitution Mexico is now a federative republic; but both the finances and administration of the country are in great disorder. A great portion of it has already been absorbed by the United States, and sooner or later the whole may come to the same end. All the well-wishers of Mexico wish that this fate for her may soon be realized.

Peru.

Peru, the country of the Incas, was first visited by the Spaniards in 1526, when Huanca Capac, the twelfth Inca, was on the throne. The government of the Incas was a theocracy, the sovereign uniting in his person the supreme temporal and spiritual power. The people were pacific and their superstition mild, in which respect they materially

differed from the Mexicans, whose superstition was ferocious. They were moreover industrious, and particularly addicted to agriculture, which they carried on with greater skill than any other nation in America. They also possessed a knowledge of various arts, such as founding metals, &c., which was peculiar to them.

The fame of the gold of Peru brought down the Spaniards to it from beyond the isthmus of Panama, the first who successfully reached it being Pizarro, a soldier of fortune, who was struck with the barbaric opulence and civilisation of the empire. He returned to Spain to obtain the royal authority to conquer it, and brought out with him three vessels carrying one hundred and eighty soldiers. He arrived at an opportune moment, when the country was involved in a civil war, and assuming the guise of an ambassador, was joyfully received by the Inca, Atahualpa, who solicited his assistance in putting down the revolt. The seizure of the king and the massacre of his troops was the established policy of Spanish faithlessness in those days, and secured the possession of the kingdom to the king of Spain.

In 1535, a general insurrection of the Peruvians took place under Manco Capac, the Peruvian heir to the throne; but this was put down. The Spaniards subsequently divided into parties and fought against each other till all the desperate characters among them were killed, which was followed by the firm establishment in the country of the royal power of Spain. The colonial system of administration adopted by that power was everywhere outrageously oppressive. It was particularly felt as such in Peru, on account of the compulsory labour imposed on the people for working the mines. Every Indian from the age of eighteen to fifty was forced to labour in the mines, and for this purpose had to quit his family, relinquish his trade or occupation, and proceed to a distance of many hundred miles; and of these many thousands perished, both from removal to a different climate and from a sudden change of habits.

The rapacity of the governors was also great, and was only equalled by the rapacity of the priests.

Goaded to insurrection by so much tyranny, an attempt to free themselves was made by the Peruvians in 1780; but this proved unsuccessful, mainly because, instead of making common cause with the Spanish Americans, the Peruvians fought indiscriminately against them and the government. The Spanish Americans were more successful when they rose against the government on the invasion of Spain by Napoleon I. Peru was the last of the Spanish possessions in America to take part in the insurrection, but was not the least successful. Its independence was finally attained in 1824. The constitution of the country is modelled on that of the United States. The people are free from direct taxation, the public revenue being mainly derived from the sale of guano.

The Smaller Spanish Republics.

The smaller Spanish republics do not require to be separately named. The main features of all of them are the same; the possession of liberty and free institutions by them is merely nominal, the chief controlling power being a military despotism. The only exception to this rule is perhaps Chili, which is better governed than the rest, and has been blessed with internal peace for a number of years; but even there the mass of the people do not understand true liberty much.

Brazil.

The only Portuguese possession of importance in South America was Brazil, which was first discovered by Pinzon, a Spaniard, but was afterwards taken possession of by Cabral, the Portuguese navigator, in 1500. At first the intercourse with the natives was very friendly, but this good understanding did not continue long. The attachment of the natives was misused, upon which they repaid ill-treatment so atrociously as led, in a short time, to an

end of voluntary emigration from Portugal. It was now that Brazil began to be utilized by the Portuguese government as a penal settlement, and the convicts sent out committed barbarities which were scarcely surpassed by those of the Spaniards in Mexico and Peru. Beyond sending the convicts, however, the Portuguese government did nothing in the country for many years, during which period some French merchants effected certain settlements on the sea-coast, while the Spaniards established themselves on the banks of the Paraguay. These advances of other nations at last alarmed the court of Portugal, and led to Brazil being divided into a number of hereditary captaincies, which were bestowed on distinguished grandees, who began to people the country at their own expense, exercising regal rights—each within his own holding. Shortly after, on account of the misuse of power by the grandees, it was found necessary to appoint a governor-general over them, the first officer of this rank being sent out in 1549.

The first colony established by the Portuguese was St. Salvador, in Bahia. The greatest service was done to it by the Jesuits, who mixed freely with the natives, conciliated their confidence and attachment, and extended the confines of the settlement. In 1578, Brazil, in common with Portugal, came under the dominion of Spain, on Sebastian of Portugal being cut off by the Moors, and remained under subjection for about sixty years. Spain being at this time at enmity with the whole world, Brazil suffered considerably from the hostility of the English, the French, and the Dutch, the last of whom succeeded in establishing in it a settlement of their own.

In 1640, Portugal shook off the Spanish yoke, and, finding that the Dutch were engaged in a sanguinary conflict with the English for the sovereignty of the seas, she also took advantage of the opportunity to recover her lost ground in Brazil, for which she afterwards paid the Dutch in hard cash, upon the whole of Brazil being ceded to her by treaty. After this there were wars again with France and Spain; but these were relieved by the brilliant discoveries

made in Brazil, first of extensive gold-fields, and afterwards of the diamond-mines for which the country has since become famous. In 1710, the French made a last effort to take Rio de Janeiro, but were defeated by the Portuguese, after which peace was concluded between the two nations.

In 1807, the French invaded Portugal with the design of seizing the royal family, upon which the whole Court, with everything that could be transported, left Portugal for Brazil. The need of Brazil to Portugal was now demonstrated; it was also established that Brazil had no longer any need of Portugal. The French invasion of Portugal thus virtually gave birth to a new empire in a new hemisphere. Brazil now became a kingdom, and began to develop herself; and when the Court returned to the mother country in 1821, Brazil insisted on her liberty, offering her throne to the prince-royal of Portugal, which, after some vain efforts to reunite the two countries, was accepted. At this moment, next to the United States and Canada, Brazil is the best governed and most progressive country in America. Her internal resources are inexhaustible, and the new government has undertaken their development with hearty good-will. But the physical disabilities of the country are great, as rocks and swamps intervene between the maritime provinces and the interior; and very rapid strides at improvement on her part are, under the circumstances, simply impossible.

CHAPTER X.

RÉSUMÉ.

IN the preceding pages we have gone into greater details than we intended, but we do not regret having done so, since those details best explain themselves. We have noted all the turning-points of modern history, and explained how the destinies of the several races were shaped; and both the resemblances among and the diversities between them have been fully accounted for. The periods which most require general attention are those relating to—

1. The emigration of nations from Asia into Europe, and the gradual distribution of the Germanic tribes over all the countries of the West.

2. The restoration of the Western empire by Charlemagne, and the development of the Saracens in Spain.

3. The consolidation of all kingdoms by the establishment of Feudalism.

4. The Crusades, and the institution of Chivalry.

5. The Tartar conquest of Russia, and the Turkish conquest of the Eastern empire.

6. The struggles for popular freedom, and the foundation of municipal towns and cities.

7. The Reformation of Religion, and the reorganization of empires and governments.

8. The discoveries of Columbus and Gama, and the colonising and commercial enterprises they gave birth to.

9. The struggles for freedom, commencing with the war of American independence.

10. The French Revolution, and the convulsions caused by Napoleon I.

11. The unifications of Italy and Germany.

12. The new order of things that has succeeded the most recent disturbances.

The theatre of the Ancient World was Asia, and only towards the end of the epoch did the empires of Greece and Rome arise. The theatre of the Modern World has been Europe wholly, the other continents and places in them being noticeable merely for such connection as they may have established with Europe. The new era begins with the emigration of nations from Asia, when the figures of Greece and Rome disappear, making way for nations hitherto unknown and undreamt of, that roll over each other like ocean billows, sweeping away the Roman power before them, but only when that power had become too corrupt to endure. The old world, found wanting after prolonged trial, is forced to fall back, and give place to newer races permitted to prove their worth. The first of these were the Goths, who are supposed to have been of non-Asiatic origin, though settled for a time in the north of Asia. They returned to Europe in the fourth century, bringing after them many nations, of whom the Huns were the most prominent. The empire of Rome was now overturned, which enabled the bishop of Rome to assume a great amount of temporal power and dignity, both of which were conceded to him from an idea that there must be a supreme authority somewhere, and from the absence of any other aspirant for such authority. The other kingdoms of Europe were simultaneously occupied and repeopled, after which the wave of inundation subsided. A faint effort to revive the empire of Rome was made in the reign of Justinian, by Belisarius and Narses, but the internal decay of the empire was too great for any such effort to succeed. The barbarians established themselves forcibly in every place, first in all the Western countries, and afterwards also in the East; and the French, becoming the central power, established themselves as such, being also the first to accept Christianity. The Anglo-Saxons in Britain received Christianity after them, but became sooner distinguished both for their intellectual and religious culture;

and they sent over Christian teachers to Germany and Switzerland, by whom both general knowledge and religion were propagated. This gave to all the countries of western Europe a nearly uniform constitution, and opened one channel of communication between peoples that had already become dissimilar.

The first great king was Charlemagne, by whom the Western empire was re-established. Previous to this the Arabs had established themselves in Spain, and had made violent efforts to conquer France, from which, however, they were heroically repelled. The empire of Charlemagne was great, but that of the Arabs was in all respects greater. The first days of Mahomedanism were barbarous, and it is recorded of Omar that he burnt the Alexandrian library; but in the days of Almánsoor and Haroun-al-Raschid, the latter of whom was contemporaneous with Charlemagne, the Arabs were the best-educated and most refined people in the world. They had a fair share of civilisation, all the institutions of social life, all the arts of industry: but the barbarians of Europe had none. The Franks in particular were not only barbarous, but grossly immoral; the other Gothic nations were perhaps not equally bad, and the Scandinavian branch of the race was probably decidedly better, but these had not yet developed themselves. The best model that Charlemagne had to follow to civilise his people was that presented by the Arabs, which was far nobler than the model held up by the Greeks; and thus France and Europe came to borrow all their civilisation from Asia. Algebra and the numerals, chemistry, medicine, and geography, were all learnt from the Arabs, and with them all the conveniences, and many of the refinements, of civilised life.

At the same time that Charlemagne contended with barbarism on the continent, Alfred was doing the same good service in England. Both these sovereigns founded schools and promoted the study of the sciences, and the latter also gave his subjects an independent constitution. But the age they lived in was that of iron, and their foster-

ing care died with them. The empire of Charlemagne was very soon broken up, and with it was lost much of the civilisation he had planted. In England, the Normans, for the time at least, uprooted all that Alfred had taken so much pains to cultivate. The world's history was thus thrown back for three hundred years.

The first era of modern history was that of the peoples. All the conquests effected by the barbarians were popular undertakings, the chiefs who directed them having scarcely higher privileges than their followers. The later movements of the Normans and the Danes partook of the same character, and so also did the establishment of the Magyars on the east of Germany. Nay, even the disruption of Charlemagne's empire was effected at the choice of the people, who demanded and selected a separate king for Germany. But, after this period, we lose sight of the multitude altogether, and read only of kings and nobles,—a change entirely brought on by the introduction of feudalism, which, as an organized plan of defence, arose spontaneously among the several races on their being settled in their new territories. The warriors who had best assisted their leaders in establishing their power, obtained, by grant or by the force of their own arms, the possession of large tracts of land, on condition of continuing the service they had rendered so well, the concession being made from the consciousness of a necessity for defending the possessions which had been acquired against the inroads of fresh aggressors. In the disorders that followed, these chiefs, so selected, asserted a lawless authority, which their kings, or superior leaders, were not able to control, and the weak, being anxious for protection, secured it by placing themselves in the same relation to the lords nearest to them as that in which they had originally stood to the paramount sovereign, holding their lands from them on terms of feudal service. The whole system was entirely defensive: it created a strong militia of landholders, great and small, to supply the place of a standing army. But it was disruptive of the former organization of the community in this way, that, on

one side, it cut down the authority of the sovereign power to a nominal supremacy, and, on the other, reduced the authority of the people, by making them thoroughly dependent. In Germany especially, throughout the feudal times, the power of the sovereign was confined to the privilege of calling the nobles together for purposes of peace or war; and in France the state of things was no better—the kingdom being reduced, as Hallam describes it, to a mere bundle of fiefs, and the king to little more than one of the feudal nobles, differing rather in dignity than in power from the rest. The system, nevertheless, had its use; for without it the kingdoms established would never have been sufficiently defended. There were no garrison towns in those days, nor regular armies; and some arrangement of the kind was absolutely necessary to secure protection against dangers both from without and within. It particularly made amends for the absence of police, the battlements of the baron providing safety not only to himself, but to all those who crowded round him for defence. In France and Germany it led eventually to the formation of principalities and seigniories, the chiefs of which became virtually independent, as they always retained under themselves a number of counts and margraves, or military functionaries with feudal rights, who followed their banners even against the common suzerain, when occasion arose; but in Britain, and the northern kingdoms generally, the system was better regulated, though there also the strong-armed Jarls often acted independently of their kings.

All this time the states of Europe were more or less isolated from each other, never coming in contact except to exchange blows. This isolation was first broken up by the Crusades, which were begun in the eleventh century and concluded in the thirteenth. Like all great movements, they did much to dissolve old bonds and further the cause of improvement. The commercial spirit of all the nations was now, for the first time, called forth; communication with other races diffused education and civilised manners; and the power of the nobility being reduced by the expenses

which were entailed on them, the cause of popular liberty began to look up ; while Chivalry, which was contemporaneous with the movement, contributed its quota of assistance in clearing the atmosphere. Some think that Chivalry was begotten of the knights ; but they were so barbarous and fierce at the age when it arose, that the more correct supposition apparently is that it was foisted into their code by the clergy, who only were in advance of the times. The nobility of the age comprised the strength of the nation, and the clergy its intelligence ; and as the latter were called forth into existence mainly for the purpose of counteracting the influence of the former, they took great pains to mitigate the condition of the people and develop their energies, by which means they knew they would be best able to hold the nobility in check. As instituted at first, Chivalry was only a defence against club-law, which was then all-prevalent. The rights of the poor were arbitrarily overridden, and innocence and weakness had no safety, the magnitude of distress no compassion. But the clergy saw that the barons, so strong-armed, were excessively weak-brained, and this enabled them to lay down rules, the acceptance of which could not but change the spirit of the times. The bait took ; and the effects of the institution were soon found to be very salutary, and have now outlasted its existence. Many of the refinements of modern society, much of the *finesse* in honour, friendship, and love, much of the endearing traits of humanity and generosity, are the remnants of a system which was introduced at the right moment, and loyally aided in ameliorating the popular condition.

The last country in the order of civilisation was Russia, though under the house of Rurik she did not appear to disadvantage as compared with other places. Her subsequent conversion into a Mogul province, which position she retained for two centuries and a half, undid the little good that was done to her by the Varangians ; nor was much done for her afterwards till the time of Peter the Great, in comparatively modern times. The Turkish conquests in the south were nearly contemporaneous with the

Tartar conquest of Russia. The ascendancy of the Crescent had given occasion to the Crusades and the disorders which were thereby committed in Lesser Asia. These were retaliated upon Europe by the Turks, who destroyed the Eastern empire after it had survived the Western empire by a thousand years, bombarding Constantinople with guns, the use of which was then little known in Europe. The whole of the eastern side of Europe was thus in trouble for a later period than the other portions of it; but the conquests of the Turks in particular were not without their advantages. The destruction of the Greek empire greatly weakened the power of the popes; and the convents with their rich libraries being opened to the world, contributed largely to the revival of letters, which, in their turn, called forth aspirations for enlightenment and liberty.

The struggles were hard which emancipated the people. The reign of slavery lasted in Germany till the beginning of the thirteenth century, in France till the middle of the fourteenth century, and in England and Italy till the beginning of the fifteenth century. But in Germany, the duration, though shortest, was more gloomy than in any other country; and it was there that the secret tribunals, originally formed for the purpose of distributing justice and protecting innocence, contributed so greatly to strengthen the rule of barbarism. The wish for human rights had, however, been already created, and could not now be kept down, for the courage to assert it had also made its appearance. Alongside of the feudal castles, villages had arisen to minister to the wants of the barons who extended their protection to them. These villages in time had become towns and cities; the extension of commerce had gradually made them rich and powerful; and when the nobles, fearing them, tried to stamp them out, they rose against them, and destroyed the reign of caste. These independent towns were most numerous in Italy, Germany, and France; there were some also in England. They introduced laws, liberty, and a republican form of government amongst themselves, and soon made considerable progress in litera-

ture, the sciences, and the arts. But their ascendancy was not the less based on a series of tumults, disorders, and high-handed acts of oppression, without which it could perhaps never have been effectually secured.

A large number of petty republics could best fight the large number of feudal barons scattered all over every country; and the system of republican towns was accordingly continued so long as it was needed. But this period was not very long. The wealth of the barons had already been reduced, and with it their power also; the discovery of gunpowder had narrowed the difference between them and the other orders; and an ecclesiastical class had arisen which, originally as tyrannical to the people as the barons themselves, had veered round to assist the former in achieving their freedom. The continuance of municipal administration ceased therefore in time to be necessary; and, left to themselves, the towns and cities began to fall out with each other, and were easily broken up. But the people had already tasted liberty—the thin end of the wedge had been securely inserted—and the problem began gradually to be worked out in all countries by which the power of the barons was overturned. The power of the sovereigns was in the same ratio increased; and the wars between France and England having broken out, led, among many mischievous results, to the one good result of combining all parties in both countries, which paved the way to the establishment of great monarchies.

The great monarchies appear at the same time with the Reformation, which was as much a political as a religious movement. Throughout the Middle Ages all power and learning were monopolised by the clergy, both from choice and from circumstances, for the other classes of Europe were then in no condition to appreciate either. This facilitated the dominion of priestcraft; the popes early took advantage of the times; a hierarchy was established in every country; and the pontifical power was gradually extended, till it attained its zenith in the thirteenth century, when the empire of old Rome was fully revived,

though in a different way, in the papacy. Of the great increase in the power of the barons we have already spoken, and, where the barons were not absolute, the power of the kings was offensively arbitrary. A great convulsion, a general purging was therefore needed by all Christendom, and this was effected by the Reformation, which reformed, not religion only, but polity also. It elevated the national mind everywhere. The darkness which succeeded the first age of Charlemagne and Alfred was only partially removed in the time of Frederick II. of Germany, and Alphonso X. of Castile. The full blaze of light was not restored till the days of Wicliffe, Huss, and Luther, when everything had to be done *de novo* for improving the popular mind, since books, schools, and knowledge had all intermediately disappeared. The power of the Church over the State was now broken down; and what was materially of great advantage to the people was that the Church lands were restored to the laity.

The consolidation of monarchies was effected during the times of Charles V., Francis I., and Henry VIII. The dissensions between Protestantism and Catholicism broke out at the same time, and continuing for a long period, disturbed the states greatly. This was fomented by the popes through the Jesuits, who had recently started into existence, and also by means of the Inquisition, which filled the world with terror. But the age which witnessed these disturbances also witnessed events of a salutary character; the era of geographical discoveries—of the explorations of Columbus and Gama, which turned over a new page of history—having immediately preceded it. The discovery of America opened out an immense field for independent growth, and made the people in all countries more self-reliant. A new world was pointed out to every one who felt his energies cramped at home; and millions and millions of oppressed subjects, or those who thought themselves to be oppressed, found exercise for their expanded hopes and aspirations in the young country beyond the wide ocean. Commerce, really so called, was now

originated ; and Spain and Portugal, as pioneers in the way of discoveries, also became, each successively, the first great commercial nation of Europe. But this position they were not able to retain long, mainly on account of their brigandism and tyranny ; and the defection of the Netherlands led to the course of traffic being diverted. The Dutch, emulating the Spaniards and the Portuguese, soon supplanted them ; and their neighbours, the English and the French, following the example, the masters of Mexico and Brazil were beaten in the race.

With the discovery of new worlds came also the discovery of the Copernican system, on which all modern science is based, and the discovery of printing, which has contributed so much to set the world free. The class of citizens and burgesses began now to develop themselves fully in every state ; and a very healthful rivalry was kept up for some time, from which Europe was recalled in the seventeenth century by the aspiring ambition of Louis XIV., who disturbed everything, and paved the way for the convulsions that came after him. France already ruled Europe by her language and refinement ; she had also taken a high stand in the culture of the mind. But what her vain and excitable people yet wanted was glory and grandeur by arms. This will-o'-wisp she pursued through many a marsh and many a fen, but only to founder deeper in the mire ; and eventually the loss to her prestige was as great as the substantial loss she sustained in comfort and possessions. Britain came out of the struggle with flying colours, but only to get foundered in her turn. The expenses of the struggle made her unjust to her colonies, which resisted her attempt to impose arbitrary taxes. This was the first great fight for independence. The cause of the United States was so good that volunteer warriors from all countries swelled the ranks of the Republican army. Not only Frenchmen, Germans, and Poles, but even Englishmen joined them as recruits. England in the war stood by herself alone ; those not in arms against her kept aloof in armed neutrality, looking at her with

lowering eyes; her hands were full of other affairs also—namely, of wars in India with the Mahrattas and Hyder Ali. The cause of independence was thus easily gained.

It was now that the eyes of France were opened to her own condition. "America, a distant colony of a rival nation, fought for and won her independence, while we," exclaimed the French, "are in our own country no better than slaves." They viewed with alarm the deficit caused in their finances by the wars of Louis XIV., and summoned the States-General, which had not met for one hundred and seventy-four years; and, when it did meet, while the aristocracy and the Church still fought for their ancient feudal rights, the people loudly demanded immunity from taxation, and the abolition of all prerogatives and privileges. The people were now the great power in the State, and, when decision on their demand was delayed, they took the law into their own hands, raising the well-known cry of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity." Their first demand was for reform, and the first scenes of the drama were confined to the declaration of rights, the abolition of prerogatives and privileges, and the repression of abuses, old and new. It would have been a great blessing to the world if they could have stopped there. Then would not France have been still so backward in the race; then would all Europe have benefited by the example and achieved her freedom. But the glory of the movement terminated at this stage. The wild and inflamed populace did not understand rights; the men who led them hounded them on after blood. The noblest movement of the modern world was thus closed in gloom.

The convulsions inaugurated by Napoleon I. represented only the rebound of the national character from real aspirations to the old pursuit after fire-flies in the mire. Their own country drenched in blood, the French eagerly sought again for war with their neighbours; and what with the wars of the Republic and the wars of the Empire, all Europe was kept in commotion till 1815. It was the old story over again, repeated through all its chapters of glory,

greatness, defeat, and shame. On one side it was a war of aggrandizement, on the other a war for the preservation of an equilibrium of power—shadows both, but which in all ages have been hotly contended for. No real equilibrium of power exists; the scale is constantly vacillating. Now it is France, now Russia, now Prussia that becomes—for the time only—the ruling military power of Europe. All others take alarm at once, and there is no rest, no cessation of fear, till a good depletion on all sides brings on a forced harmony. The millennium is yet far in the rear—even the millennium of an equilibrium which will leave present arrangements intact has not yet been found. People fancied that it followed the days of Waterloo, till they were awakened from their dreams by the booming of guns in Italy and Germany.

The unifications of Italy and Germany are recent events, fresh in the recollection of our readers. If Napoleon III. did any good act throughout the whole course of his imperial career, that act was the assistance he rendered to Italy in carrying out the scheme of Cavour. France might well have rested content with the glory of the achievement. Every page of history records her frantic struggles for fame and success, which she was seldom able to secure. She won both on the fields of Magenta and Solferino; but, with a meanness for which the emperor alone was personally responsible, the assistance of France was *sold*. The work of the Italian patriots has, however, not yet been completed. If fresh convulsions in Germany, which are daily becoming more imminent, give Austria the opportunity to do so, she may yet fight, and fight harder than before, for the recovery of her lost possessions in Italy, unless the entire consolidation of that country intermediately should shut out all hopes of success. The present aspect of Europe gives no assurance on the subject on either side.

As for the unification of Germany, the Prussians have carried it out with a high hand, and are apparently strong enough to maintain it as vigorously as it has been secured. But Germany cannot remain in her present condition long;

the hothouse growth she has attained will not last except with the aid of many attendant changes, and it is more than likely that her next convulsion will break out from within; and unless the confederated states are really well-attached to each other, their unification may yet disappear as a dream, for all that Bismarck and Moltke have achieved to secure it. The peace which reigns in Europe now is hollow to the core; and Europe knows it, for she is armed to the teeth. Germany has a total army of 1,800,000 men, and is not yet satisfied with her preparations; the army of Russia, taking the forces in Europe and Asia together, amounts to about 1,400,000 men; that of Austria to about 850,000; that of France to about 750,000; that of Italy is nearly equal to that of France; while even that of England amounts to about 300,000—being larger almost in every case than can possibly be necessary, except to keep up the play that is expected and feared. The strength of France only has been temporarily curtailed, but is in a state of reorganization; and as the law of the country enacts universal liability to arms, it can at any moment be very largely increased. Each country is therefore provided with the amplest means of resistance in case of need; and what this may eventually lead to it is impossible to foretell. Every man armed with the bayonet is necessarily a loss to the plough, and the plough cannot be neglected long for the bayonet with impunity. The complaints of the working classes in Germany are loud already, and are at the same time felt to be just, for the great industries are being ruined, and commerce has long ceased to thrive. Thousands of people are condemned to idleness and look upon the government with distrust; and the enemies of the empire are agitating on all sides. Of what use will be her 1,800,000 well-trained soldiers when her working classes—those very soldiers in fact—rise up to demand peace, free institutions, and bread?

The five great powers in the age of the Reformation were France, Spain, Portugal, England, and Austria; the five great powers of the present day are England, France,

Prussia or Germany, Austria, and Russia; so that Spain and Portugal only have gone out to make room for Prussia and Russia, which have since developed themselves. Of these England alone holds her position in consideration of her moral greatness, the richness of her dependencies, her commerce, and her constitution, and doubtless also as the first naval power in the world; while all the other great powers owe their position, more or less, to their military organization, France owing it also to her refinement, and the influence of her manners and language on Europe. The resources of all these powers are very great; but only those of France and England have been fairly developed. The others have been too busy in drilling their soldiers; and the workman withdrawn from his industry, of course, does not work. England, the smallest state in Europe, enjoys a first-class position with the smallest number of soldiers, with reference both to aggregate strength, and to percentage on population. But this is not her only claim to pre-eminence. In common with France she leads the van in civilisation; while, in common with America, she spreads it out farthest in every direction. The commercial spirit of the English and the Americans carry them to every part of the globe; and they carry civilisation with them, albeit it is accompanied by the brandy-bottle. England makes no impression in Europe with her army, for her 300,000 men in Europe, and her 200,000 men in India, are but poor figures against those the great autocrats play with. But beyond their large armies the autocrats have nothing to show, while England exhibits her unbounded wealth, her swarming masses of industrious workmen, her limitless marine. In all these respects America follows in the wake of England closely. The people of both countries are contented and happy, because always at work; the working classes in both are more or less in easy circumstances.

In Europe the example of England has not been much followed. It is not that the other countries do not want to be like her, but that they are unwilling to abandon their own peculiar ways. The wish to be like her is manifested

by the general imitation of her constitution ; but the form only has been imitated, not the spirit of it, and the consequence is that, while Alfred's wish that the English people should be as free as their thoughts has been fully realized, no other people in Europe has yet approached them in that respect. Religious and mental liberty have vindicated themselves almost equally in most of the European countries ; the arts and the sciences have been improved and inventions multiplied in Germany and Italy as much as in England and France ; the refinements of private life have also been augmented in all places, though not to the same extent ; and in most of them the condition of the humbler classes has been much though not equally improved : but the position of the English people, who seek for no social regeneration, and among whom the word revolution has long been forgotten, has nowhere been attained.

We have confined our remarks mainly to the states of Europe, because Europe, with the United States and the dependencies of Great Britain, virtually constitute the modern world. The states of Asia are old and effete ; those of Africa are as barbarous as can well be conceived ; and those of America, excluding the United States and Canada, too unsettled for the formation of any decisive opinion in respect to them. Apart from Europe, the amount of ignorance, barbarism, and misery in all places is still very great, notwithstanding the general boast of the civilisation of the nineteenth century. In most of the other places no civilisation has yet penetrated, while in some of them the civilisation they had has worn out. The progress in material things has latterly been rather remarkable in all places which are not absolutely new. Even China and Japan have accepted physical improvements as represented by ironclads and arms of precision, and are constructing railways, and talk of laying down telegraph-cables to join them with their dependencies. But the spheres of social, intellectual, and political improvement have not been equally, or even proportionately, expanded. The progress

in literature is usually held to be marvellous, and the influence exercised by it has generally been exercised in the well-being of mankind. But the area within which there has been any progress to speak of is, after all, very limited : for the portion of the world that reads and writes is still less than the portion that does not read and write ; and the effete states of the East, which do read and write, refuse to accept the mental culture of the West, without which even the closest imitation of her physical improvements will not rescue them from their social and political degradation. The same remark applies also to the sciences and the arts, which, born in Asia, have been preserved in and have spread over Europe, where they have received a new impetus, improving both in standard and taste ; but to a large portion of the world they are at this moment not sufficiently known either to aid in the preservation of life, or to secure its comforts and conveniences.

This is a sad picture of the world we live in. It is doubtful if all the barbarous races in it are capable of being civilised ; but there is no question that a great many of them are, as our experience in North and South America, in Australasia, and in several of the Pacific islands, has already established. An attempt on a wholesale scale ought now to be made to civilise them all ; and this should find better occupation for Germany, Austria, and France than that which engages them at this moment. The first action of the nations that migrated from Asia into Europe was destruction, everything everywhere being by them overturned and levelled with the ground. The first action of the conquerors and colonisers of modern times, including the Spaniards, Portuguese, English, French, and Americans, has similarly been to destroy, not institutions only, but even the aboriginal races they came in contact with. A better policy has since been recognised, though we cannot say that it has yet been generally acted upon. The descendants of the Vikings, who distinguished themselves by conquests, but did not exterminate the races they conquered, now admit the principle that it is better to let the barba-

rians live, and to buy them over by teaching them the arts of peace, though some still doubt whether it be possible in every instance to do so. The world, it is freely admitted, is wide enough to hold all the nations in it, including both those who are free and fortunate, and those who are yet held in the bonds either of barbarism or slavery; but it is contended that it has been found by practical experience that the contiguous residence of civilised and barbarous races is often impossible, and necessarily leads to oppression and extermination. If it really be so, it behoves the civilised world all the more to regenerate those who are uncivilised, even with a little violence to commence with; and this can only be fully accomplished, not by missionary exertions, but by secular arms. Charlemagne civilised the Saxons by the sword; let the descendants of Charlemagne now civilise the benighted inhabitants of Asia, Africa, and America in the same way, should there really be no better course to follow. Up to this time what has civilisation achieved worth boasting of? Great were the expectations that wars would die out, and that nations would live side by side in love and peace. That delusion has long been dissipated; Christianity has failed to establish the dominion of love and peace which was preached by it so ardently; wars not only continue, but are day by day being rendered more and more scientific, destructive, and universal. Reading the history of the world carefully, it seems doubtful whether any real advance beyond mere change has ever been made. It certainly does seem that we are only turning with an ever-turning circle, which presents to us different, but not necessarily progressive, phases as it goes round. Assyrian and Persian greatness, and Grecian and Roman greatness, have made way for English and French greatness, which in their turn will probably yield to American and Russian, and Canadian and Australasian greatness; but the character of the greatness in different ages does not appear to have really much varied. Why does war still define greatness; why is the most martial nation yet held to be the first? Actually this is not so. Europe, the smallest part of the

world, governs the rest, though even now the most martial races of mankind are to be found in Asia; and England, the smallest part of Europe, is in reality the first power in it, though possibly vastness may have its day in the future, as represented by America and Russia, which are now contending for the post of honour, and by Canada and Australasia, which will claim it in due course. Why, then, should military prowess be still held in general estimation to be the one and only criterion of national pre-eminence? It is this great mistake that is prolonging the era of barbarism. If a life of perpetual tumult be as necessary to states as to individuals, is there no means of securing it apart from feuds and fears? Roll up the stone of Sisyphus by all means as often as it rolls down, if it be the unavoidable condition of our existence to do so. But let us vary the exertion intelligently, by accepting operations still more arduous and far more glorious than fighting with and destroying each other, either for the Rhine frontier, or for the possession of Constantinople.

The regeneration of Asia has been undertaken by Russia. England, satisfied with India, is unable to achieve more, and any attempt on her part to thwart Russia must therefore be simply abortive; for Providence looks not to the greatness of either Russia or England, but to the well-being of the world. England has, for herself, chosen the colonisation of Australasia and Canada, a glorious undertaking, which promises her the greatest honour and success. The boast of France has been that the French language is the language of Europe; the boast of England soon will be that the English language is the language of the world. The United States of America have also chosen a splendid field for themselves in their own part of the globe, to which they are trying to do their duty well, though they have most unnecessarily depopulated it of its aboriginal races. Could not the other great empires of the world—Germany, Austria, and France—and the smaller states of Europe, take a share in the work of regeneration, by selecting special fields of exertion in Africa and America and other places

yet unoccupied by any European power? Jean Paul Richter used to say that while the French held the sovereignty of the land, and the English the sovereignty of the sea, the Germans had appropriated to themselves the sovereignty of the air. The Teutons have since deprived the Franks, for the time at least, of their land sovereignty; but have nevertheless not yet come down from their aerial elevation. It is time, however, that they should; and the advantage of their present position gives them special facilities which ought not to be neglected. One-fourth of the large army of Germany, which keeps all Europe in tremor, would conquer and then civilise one-half of the African continent. Observe calmly, and it will be seen that the only nations that are doing best are those that have created work for themselves in this way—namely, Russia, America, and England; that the great nations that are not prospering are those fighting for shadows—a fancied unification where there is no real unity, or a convenient boundary-line which it will always require two parties to agree to. Providence has plenty of useful work for all, if they will only take the trouble to find it out. The fitness of Africa and South America for European colonisation may perhaps be disputed: though it appears to us that, if unfit for colonisation by Englishmen, they are not necessarily unfit for colonisation by the Germans, a cold and sober people well calculated to hold their ground where the English would give way. But, even if it be otherwise, both Africa and America are certainly open to civilisation by conquest in the manner which has been so successfully followed in India and Central Asia; and a worthier object of ambition could not be held up for general competition. “The age of chivalry is gone,” exclaimed Burke, “and that of sophists, economists, and calculators has succeeded, which has extinguished the glory of Europe for ever.” But we do not think that it is so. It is true that the age of commerce, the best friend of man, has to some extent displaced the age of military bravado, which was, and yet continues to be, the greatest enemy of the world; but real chivalry has not

gone out from us altogether, and is not incompatible with economy and calculation : and this it is yet open to Germany to come forward and establish.

Germany has no colonies of her own at present, and yet the number of emigrants from the country every year is very great. Emigration, in fact, is the safety-valve of the modern world ; without such depletion the mother country would in a short time be reduced to the greatest distress from plethora and apoplexy. How, then, does the case with Germany actually stand ? She sends out all her superfluous energy to America, or, in other words, pays tribute to America in men, just as the Spaniards paid tribute to the Moors in maidens. These emigrants catch republican ideas in their new homes, and transmit them in due course to their fatherland. The rulers of Germany well know how that is operating at home, how the materials for a revolution are being slowly and gradually collected. This alone should induce Germany to found a colony of her own.

Of course emigration will conflict with the military spirit of the mother country, but only in the way it has done in England. It will not make the nation less warlike in its real need, but it will make it less pugnacious by rendering the maintenance of a large army too expensive for mere show. On the other hand, it will raise the condition of the middle classes throughout the country ; and in the modern world, those countries only are and will be the greatest in which the middle classes thrive best. The lower classes even in England are not as well off as could be desired ; but for this, also, emigration is the best, perhaps the only remedy, as it opens out to those classes the widest sphere of usefulness at a distance from home. The history of the world, as we read it, teaches us that kings nowhere were ever, as a rule, very brilliant specimens of humanity ; and the policy followed in Turkey for several centuries of deposing those who were found to be imbecile, appears to us to have been a very convenient one, which other nations would have done well to imitate. At any rate, a blind

admiration of imperialism at this hour of the day cannot but be regarded as a grievous mistake. Nor do we find anywhere that the nobles and the clergy were ever gifted with any extra degree of self-denial. There is no reason, therefore, why the general mass of any community should sacrifice their interests for the good, real or imaginary, of either kaiser or lord. "Each for himself, and God for us all," is the best motto both for individuals and nations; and the people of Germany, acting in accordance with that motto, should take their concerns into their own hands, as the people of England have done for a long time past, and emulate the policy inaugurated by England and Russia. They should not, however, go out merely as plundering adventurers, as the Spaniards and the Portuguese did. No possessions held on that tenure can last long. The mission must be one of civilisation; actual benefits must be conferred on the barbarian nations that are subdued: and such service in the general interests of mankind will always bring its own reward.

INDEX.

A BOUKIE BAY, battle of, 309.

Achmet Kiuprili, vizier of Turkey, abilities of, 412 ; conquests of, 412.

Africa, divisions of, 425 ; connection of the Portuguese with, 426 ; connection of the English with, 426 ; Christianity in, 426 ; suggestion for working out the future of, 427 ; plan for watering the interior of, 427 ; condition of the states of, 448.

African States, the, 425.

Agincourt, battle of, 212.

Agriculture, development of, in England, 223.

Alexander I. of Russia, treaty of Tilsit concluded by, 369 ; annexation of Finland by, 370 ; invasion of Russia in the reign of, 370.

Alexander II. of Russia, liberation of serfs by, 376.

Alfred, check given to the Danes in England by, 207 ; service to England of, 436.

Algiers, acquisition of, by France, 313.

Alsace and Lorraine, resumption of, by Germany, 317, 345.

America, first colonisation of, 263 ; first colonisation of, by the English, 263, 265 ; treatment of the primitive inhabitants of, 263 ; landing of the pilgrim fathers in, 265 ; character of the early emigrants to, 265 ; quarrels between England and her colonies in, 266 ; declaration of the rights and grievances of the colonies in, 266 ; declaration of independence by thirteen states in, 267 ; war for independence in, 267 ; recognition of the independence of, 268 ; second war of, with England, 270 ; development of the United States of, 270 ; civil war in, 273 ; liberation of slaves in, 274, 275 ; system of government in, 276 ; civilisation in, 279 ; shortcomings of the people of, 280 ; intellectual development of the people of, 281 ; character of the people of, 281 ; natural associations of the people of, 283 ; ill-will of, towards England, 284, 285 ; actual position of, 284 ; mission of, as distinguished from that of England, 284 ; destiny of, 285 ; bee in the bonnet of, 286 ; condition of the minor states of, 448.

American independence, war of the, 216, 268, 306, 434, 444.

Amurath I., reduction of Adrianople by, 411.

Amurath II., defeat of the Hungarians by, 412.

Arabia, 424.

Arabia, modern history of, 424 ; propagation of Mahomedanism and increase in the greatness of, 424 ; extent of, 424 ; destruction of the Kaliphate and decline of, 424 ; Wahabee movement in, 424 ; present sovereignty over, 425 ; condition of the people of, 425.

Arabs, empire of the, in Spain, 290, 396, 434, 436 ; civilisation of the, 436.

Armies, European, strength of the, 446.

Asia, condition of the states of, 448.

Asiatic nations, necessary fate of, 202.

Auerstadt, battle of, 310.

Australasia, 253.

Australasia, present divisions of, 256; success of colonisation in, 257; chief wealth of, 257; population of, 258; commercial wealth of, 258; forms of government in, 259; advance in social matters in, 259; relations between the white and aboriginal races in, 260.

Australia, extent and description of, 253; history of the discovery of, 254; first settlements in, 254; emigration of Scotch Presbyterians to, 255; "gold fever" in, and its results, 255.

Austria, formation of the house of, 332; dominance of the house of, in Germany, 334; unsuccessful attempt to dismember the possessions of, 339; separation of, from Germany by the treaty of Presburg, 341; reunion of, with Germany, 341; discord of, with Prussia, 342; war of, with Prussia, and separation of, from Germany by the treaty of Prague, 343; insurrections in, 343; concessions to the Hungarians by, 343.

BAJÁZET, defeat of a Christian army by, 411; defeated by Timourlung, 411.

Bátou Khán, conquest of Russia by, 357.

Belgium, union of, with Holland, 393; expulsion of the Dutch from, 393; independence of, 393; present condition of, 393.

Bill of Rights, character of the, 215, 220.

Blenheim, battle of, 215, 303.

Blois, assassinations of, 299.

Brazil, 431.

Brazil, discovery of, by Pinzon, 431; taken possession of by Cabral, 431; ill-treatment of the natives in, and their retaliation, 431; utilization of, as a penal settlement, 432; French and Spanish settlements in, 432; division of, into hereditary captaincies, 432; appointment of a governor-general for, 432; colony of St. Salvador in, 432; services rendered by the Jesuits in, 432; domination of Spain over, 432; regained by Portugal, 432; discoveries of gold-fields and diamond-mines in, 433; defeat of the French by the Portuguese in, 433; flight of the Portuguese court to, 433; independence of, 433; present condition of, 433.

Burmáh, 419.

Burmáh, annexation of, to Pegu, 420; independence regained, by, 420; ill-faith of the English and French in, 420; unsuccessful invasion of, by the Chinese, 420; intercourse of, with the English, 420; war of, with the English, and its results, 420; government of, 420; religion of, 421.

CANADA, 247.

Canada, extent of, 247; provinces comprised in, 247; history of settlement in, 247; conquest of, from the French, 248; attacks of, by the Americans, 249, 250; division of, into two parts, and constitution given to each, 250; rebellion in, 251; improved administration of, 251; relations of, with the United States, 252.

Canadian Dominion, formation of the, 251; extent of the, 251; original inhabitants of the, 251; commercial value of the, 252.

Catherine II. of Russia, ascent to the throne of, 367; immoral life of, 367;

- abilities of, 367; achievements of, 367; partition of Poland by, 368; death of, 368.
- **Celan**, the, 198; in Britain, 198, 205, 206; in France, 198, 288, 289; in Spain, 198, 396; in Italy and the Alps, 198; in the Netherlands, 390.
- Charlemagne**, subjugation of the Moslems by, 290; subjugation of the Saxons by, 290; extent of the empire of, 321; crowned Emperor of the West, 291, 322.
- Charles I.**, rebellion in England in the reign of, 214; reign of, overthrown, and king beheaded, 215.
- Charles II.**, elevation of, to the English throne, 215; neglect of the fleet by, 228.
- Charles V.** of Germany, reign of, 335; condemnation of the Reformation by, 336; protest of certain princes and cities, and civil war against, 336; concessions by, 336; subsequent conduct of, 337; opposition to, and success of the Protestants, 337; abdication of the throne by, 337.
- Charles the Bald**, the first king of France, 291.
- Charles of Burgundy**, league of, against France, 296; partition of the dominions of, 335.
- Charles Martel** of France, success of, against the Saracens, 290; clerical testimony regarding the fate of the soul of, 290.
- China**, 415.
- China**, geographical extent of, 415; modern history of, 415; visit of Marco Polo to, 415; Portuguese visit to, 415; Jesuits, Dominicans, and others in, 415; British intercourse with, 416; opening of the treaty-ports of, 416; population of, 416; civilisation of, 416; government of, 416; religion of, 417; present strength of, 417; arts of peace in, 417.
- Chivalry**, institution of, 292, 434, 439; character of, 439.
- Civilisation**, distinguishing traits of, in the ancient and modern worlds, 196; different phases of, at the present day, 199; suggestion for the extension of, 449, 452.
- Clovis** of France, rule of, 288; division of the sovereign power equally between the sons of, 289.
- Colonisation**, the remedy for national overgrowth, 236; facilitated by geographical discoveries and explorations, 434, 442.
- Columbus**, discovery of America by, 263, 398, 434, 442.
- Commerce**, history of, in England, 225; treaty of, between England and France, 314; facilitated by geographical discoveries and explorations, 434, 442.
- Copernican system**, discovery of, 443.
- Cortez**, conquest of Mexico by, 398, 427.
- Cressy**, battle of, 212.
- Crimean War**, 233, 315, 370, 414.
- Cromwell**, military despotism in England of, 215; exertions of, to improve the fleet, 228.
- Crusades**, age of the, 293, 434; number of the, 293; advantages derived from the, 293, 438.
- Czar**, signification of the word, 359.
- DANES**, invasions and conquest of England by the, 206, 207; present spirit of the, 390.
- Denmark**, formation of a regular government in, 387; introduction of Chris-

tianity into, 387; union of, with Norway, 387; amalgamation of, with Sweden, 388; German dynasty in, and secession of Sweden from, 388, 389; annexation of Sleswig and Holstein to, and their recent separation from, 389; destruction of the fleet of, by Nelson, 389; forcible separation of Norway from, 389; national spirit in, 390; present condition of, 390.

Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, 386.

DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE, *THE*, 236.

Dias, discovery of the Cape of Good Hope by, 402.

EASTERN EMPIRE, Turkish attacks upon and conquest of the, 410, 411, 434, 440.

Edward III. of England, wars of, in France, 212, 294; naval victories of, 218.

Egbert, formation of one monarchy in England by, 206.

Egypt, establishment of an hereditary *pashalic* in, 414.

Elizabeth of England, distinguished reign of, 213; mercantile adventures and geographical discoveries in the time of, 213; wars of, 214; establishment of a school of marines by, 218.

Emigration of nations from Asia into Europe, 198, 434, 435.

Empires and governments, reorganization of, 434, 441, 442.

England, slow and gradual development of, 219; constitution of, 220; power of the monarchy in, 220; liberty enjoyed by the people of, 220; law of publicity in, 221; constitution of the peerage of, 221; position of country gentlemen in, 222; agricultural development of, 223; industrial development of, 224; history of the commerce of, 225; intellectual and moral grandeur of, 226; physical strength of, 227; formation of the navy of, 227; materials for maritime strength in, 229; present state of the navy of, 230; army of, 231; military spirit and resources of, 232; notions regarding the decline of, 233; disproportionate greatness of, 234; general hatred of, 234; example of, 447.

English army, history of the, 231.

English colonies, creation of the, 237; relation of the, to the mother country, 261; alleged defencelessness of the, 262.

English colonisation, extent of, 236; development of, 237.

English navy, history of the, 227; present state of the, 229, 230.

Equilibrium of power, real character of the, 445.

FEUDALISM, in Britain, 210, 213; in France, 289, 296; in Germany, 323, 326; reasons for the introduction of, 437; consolidation of kingdoms by, 434, 438.

Fontenoy, battle of, 232, 304.

FRANCE, OR THE *Grande Nation*, 287.

France, old history of, 288; Roman rule in, 288; settlement of Franks in, 288; aggrandizement of, under Charlemagne, 290; splitting up of, into principalities, 291; Norman invasions of, 291; settlement of the Normans in, 291; birth of chivalry in, 292; enthusiasm for the crusades in, 293; wars of the English in, 294; English prince on the throne of, 295; expulsion of the English from, 295; Jacquerie, or mob-rising in, 295; feudal system in, 296; breaking-up of feudalism and organization of armies in, 297; wars of, with Germany, 298, 299, 303, 309, 310, 311, 312, 316;

reign of Henry IV. and establishment of religious toleration in, 300; reign of Louis XIII. and administration of Richelieu in, 301; humiliation of the nobles and people in, 301; reign of Louis XIV. in, 301; wars of the Fronde in, 301; persecution of the Protestants in, 302; establishment of absolute despotism in, 302; career of aggression opened by, and final discomfiture of, 303; Augustan age of, 304; territorial losses of, in the Seven Years' War, 304; second Augustan age of, 305; causes of the Great Revolution in, 305; progress of the revolution in, 307; deposition and execution of the king in, 307; other barbarities in, 308; republican wars of, 308; revolution effected by Bonaparte in, 309; wars and conquests of the Consulate, 309; further revolution in, and wars of the Empire, 309; contemplated invasion of England by, 310; invasion of Russia by, 311; defeat of Napoleon at Leipsic, and occupation of Paris by the allies, 311; flight of Napoleon to Elba, and return thence to, 312; overthrow of Napoleon at Waterloo, 312; despatch of Napoleon to St. Helena, 312; revolution restoring the old monarchy in, 313; summary of the Orleans rule in, 313; dethronement of the king and formation of a republic in, 314; dissolution of the republic in, by Louis Napoleon, 314; establishment of the Second Empire in, 314; wars of the Second Empire and causes thereof, 315; the Franco-German war, defeat of France, and deposition of Napoleon III., 316; present provisional government in, 317; territorial compensation exacted by Germany from, 317, 345; character of the government in, 317; worship of the ideal in, 318; character of the people of, 318; prospect of the restoration of imperialism in, 319.

Francis I. of France, contention of, for the emperorship of Germany, 297; wars of, with Charles V., 298; defeat and capture of, 298; release of, 298; patronage extended by, to literature and the arts, 298; cruelties of, to the Waldenses of Piedmont, 298; general persecution of heretics by, 298.

Franco-German war, 316, 343.

Franks in Gaul, 198, 288, 436.

Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, humiliation of, before the Pope, 327; vigorous administration of, 327; knighthood of the gentlemen-volunteers of, 330.

Freedom, popular, struggles for, 434, 440.

French alliance and treaty of commerce with England, 314.

French revolution, causes of the, 306; first features of the, 307; outbreak of the, 307; barbarities of the, 307; wars of the, 308, 340; résumé, relative to the, 434, 444; other subsequent revolutions, 308, 309, 313, 314.

Fronde, wars of the, in France, 301.

GAMA, VASCO DE, explorations of, 402, 434, 442.

Geographical discoveries, 213, 398, 434, 442.

George I. of England, the seraglio of, 216.

George III. of England, reign of, 216; war of, with France, 216; civil administration of, 218.

George IV. of England, reign of, 219.

GERMANY, 320.

Germany, ancient inhabitants of, 320; establishment of Christianity in, 321; conquest of, by the Franks, 321; affairs of, interwoven with those of France, 322; relations of, with the Pontificate, 322; separation of, from

- France, 323; sovereign of, made elective, 323; main divisions of society in, 323; consolidation of, by Henry the Fowler, 324; reign of Otho the Great in, and election of a pope by him, 324; reign of Henry IV. in, and discords with the pope, 325; internal feuds and excesses in, 326; wars of the Guelphs and Ghibelines, 327, 328; reign of Frederick Barbarossa in, and his behaviour towards the pope, 327; the Hanseatic league in, 329; Teutonic order of knighthood in, 330; Vehm Gerichte, or secret tribunals of, 331; succession of Rodolph I. to the throne of, and formation of the house of Austria in, 332; publication of the Pragmatic Sanction by, 332; promulgation of the Golden Bull by, 332; formation of Diets or General Assemblies in, 333; quarrels of, with Switzerland, and their results, 333; dominance of the house of Austria in, 334; establishment of perpetual peace by the Diet in, 335; re-division of, into ten circles, 335; reign of Charles V. in, 335; reformation of religion in, and its condemnation by the Diet of Spire, 336; protest of certain princes and cities, followed by a civil war in, 336; success of the reformers, and abdication of the throne of, by Charles, 337; Thirty Years' War for repression of the Protestants in, 337; Protestantism established in, by the peace of Westphalia, 337; Rhine provinces taken away from, by France, 337; footing obtained by Sweden in, 337; splitting-up of, into parts, and internal feuds, 338; aggressions on, by Louis XIV., 338; development of Prussia in, 339; constitution of, subverted by Napoleon I., and formation of a protected confederation, excluding Austria, 341; formation of a new independent confederation by the Congress of Vienna, 341; disaccord between Prussia and Austria in, 342; dissolution of the confederation and reconstruction of, 343; war of, with France, 343; unification of, 344, 434, 445; present military system of, and its effects, 344, 446; feature of the early history of, 346; relative position of sovereign, aristocracy, and clergy in, 346; progress made in, since the Reformation, 347; present position of, 348, 446; aspirations for liberal institutions in, 348; complaints in, 446; task for, 452.
- Germanic tribes, distribution of the, 198, 321, 434, 435.
- Gibraltar, acquisition of, by the English, 228.
- Godunof, Boris, of Russia, scheme for reducing the nobles and people completed by, 361.
- Golden Bull, promulgation of, 332.
- Golden Horde, supremacy of the, over Russia, 357; refusal of tribute to the, 358; attack on the, by Timour, 358; destruction of the, 359.
- Goths, in Germany and Scandinavia, 198, 387; different subdivisions of the, 320; character of the, 320.
- Government, different forms of, 201; comparison between the English and American forms of, 276.
- Granson, Murten, and Nancy, battles of, 395.
- GREAT BRITAIN, 204.
- Great Britain, position of, 204; fabulous history of, 205; Celts, the first known inhabitants of, 205; wars with the Romans in, 205; retirement of the Romans from, 205; arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in, 206; Saxon era in the history of, 206, 209; Danish invasions and conquest of, 206, 207; Norman conquest of, 207; character of the Norman rule over, 208, 210; wars of, for the crown of France, 212; civil wars in, 212, 214; Tudor era

in the history of, 213; Stuart era in the history of, 214; success of the Great Rebellion in, 214; Revolution of 1688 in, 214; literary eras of, 214, 215, 219; wars of, with Louis XIV. of France, 216; union of England and Scotland, and adoption of the consolidated title of, 216; completion of the civil, religious, and political institutions of, 216; Hanoverian rule in, 216; war of, with the United States, 216; acknowledgment of the independence of the United States by, 217; fresh wars of, with France, 217; French possessions in the East and West Indies taken by, 217; incorporating union of, with Ireland, 218; progressive character of the reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria in, 218, 219.

Great Powers, positions of the, 446.

Greece, independence of, 413.

Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, leader of the Protestant princes of Germany, 337, 338; death of, at Lützen, 337, 338.

HABEAS CORPUS ACT, passing of the, 215.

Hanseatic League, history of the, 329.

Hastings, battle of, 208.

Henry the Fowler, consolidation of Germany by, 324.

Henry IV. of France, conversion to Catholicism of, 300; establishment of toleration in religion by, 300; wise and vigorous administration of, 300; murder of, 301.

Henry IV. of Germany, discords of, with the pope, 325; rebellion of the sons of, 326; execrable private life of, 326.

Heptarchy in England, 206.

Historical periods, 434.

Hohenlinden, battle of, 309.

Holland, union of, with Belgium, 393; separation of, from Belgium, 393; present condition of, 393.

Holland and Belgium, 390.

Hudson-Bay territory, history of the, 248; transfer of the, to Canada, 249; present condition of the, 249.

Hungary, rebellions in, 338, 343.

IGNORANCE, general prevalence of, 448.

INDEPENDENT STATES OF ASIA, AFRICA, AND AMERICA, THE, 415.

India, 237.

India, first English factories in, 238; rivalry of the English, Dutch, Portuguese, and French in, 238; quarrels between the English and the French in, 239; collapse of the French power in, 239; extension of the British territories in, 240; wrongful establishment of the British power in, 240; assumption of the management of, by the British Crown, 241; native attempts to overturn British power in, 241; character of the British rule in, 241; Russophobia and the Afghan war, 242; loss of prestige by the English in, and further wars, 242, 243; probable issue of a Russian invasion of, 243, 244; greatness and wealth of the English empire in, 246.

Inquisition, in France, 299; in Holland, 391; in Spain, 398; in Portugal, 402.

Italy, 405.

Italy, reconquest of, 405; sale of, to the Lombards, 405; divided rule in, 405; kingdom of the Lombards in, overturned, 405; formation of the pontificate in, 405; quarrels between the popes and emperors in, 405, 406; internal divisions and contentions in, 406; invasion of, by the Normans, and conquests in, 406; rise of the free cities in, 406; rival popes in, 407; reformation of religion in, 407; decline of, 407; principal divisions of, 408; invasion of, by Bonaparte, 408; Bonaparte crowned king of, 408; redivision of, 408; aspirations for independence in, 408; expulsion of the pope from, 408; re-establishment of the pope in, 409; unification of, 409, 434, 445; constitution of, 409; literary celebrities of, 409; intellectual decline of, 409.

Ivan I. of Russia, reunion of private appanages by, 357; removal of the seat of government to Moscow by, 357.

Ivan III. of Russia, destruction of the Golden Horde and liberation of Russia by, 359; wars of, 359; other improvements by, 359.

Ivan IV. of Russia, the first Czar, 359; establishment of a standing army by, 359; other achievements of, 360; cruelties of, 360; conquest of Siberia in the reign of, 360.

JANIZARIES, or life-guards, formation of, 411.*Japan, 417.*

Japan, foundation of monarchy in, 417; government of, 417; Portuguese intercourse with, 418; Dutch and English merchants invited to, 418; Christian plot for overturning the native empire in, 418; landing of Christians prohibited in, 418; attempts to reopen communication with, 418; opening of the treaty-ports of, 419; civilisation of, 419; government of, 419; education in, 419.

Jena, battle of, 310.

KNIGHTHOOD, orders and associations of, 293; duties of, 293; abolition of the orders of, 294; Teutonic order of, 330.

Knowledge in the ancient and modern worlds, distinguishing traits of, 196.

LAUPFELT, battle of, 232, 304.*Leipsic, battle of, 311.*

Liberty, civil and political, as attained by different states, 200; all states not qualified for, 201; British Isles the home of, 204.

Ligny, battle of, 312.

Literary celebrities, of Great Britain, 214, 215, 219; of the United States, 282; of France, 287, 304, 305; of Germany, 348; of Sweden, 389; of Spain, 400; of Italy, 409.

London, convention of, 414.

Louis XIV. of France, persecution of reformers by, 302; issue of *lettres de cachet* by, 302; suppression of political independence by, 302; concessions for popularity by, 303; assumption of the title of *Grande Monarque* by, 303; career of aggression opened by, 303; discomfiture of, 303; authors in the age of, 304; treatment of Fenelon by, 304; treatment of James II. of England by, 304.

Louis XV. of France, authors in the reign of, 305.

Louis XVI. of France, revolution in the reign of, 306; deposition and execution of, 307.

• Lützen, battle of, 337, 388.

MAGENTA, battle of, 409.

• Magna Charta, character of, 211.

Mahomed II., capture of Constantinople by, 412.

Mahomed IV., defeat of, by Sobieski, king of Poland, 413; deposition of, 413.

Mahomedanism, progress of, in the south-west of Europe, 290; checked by Charles Martel and Charlemagne, 290; in the south-east of Europe, checked by the Austrians and the Poles, 340.

Malplaquet, battle of, 303.

Man of the Iron Mask, story of, 302.

Manufactures, development of, in England, 224.

Maoris in New Zealand, 256.

Maori Members in the House of Representatives in New Zealand, 259.

Marengo, battle of, 309, 368, 408.

Marlborough, victories of, 215, 303, 338, 399.

Mercantile adventures and geographical discoveries, age of, 213, 398, 402, 442.
Mexico, 427.

Mexico, conquest of, by Cortez, 428; conversion of, to Catholicism, 428; government of, 428; formation of a creole population in, 428; insurrection in, 428; second revolution in, and independence of, 429; republican government in, 429; subsequent history of, 429.

Migration of nations, 198; results of the, 198.

Minden, battle of, 304.

Minor Colonies, the, 260.

Minor Colonies of Great Britain, enumeration of the, 260.

MINOR STATES OF EUROPE, THE, 386.

Monarchies, establishment of, 441; consolidation of, 442.

Morgarten, the Marathon of Switzerland, battle of, 334, 394.

Moscow, repulse of Napoleon I. from, 311, 370.

Mount Tabor, battle of, 309.

Municipal towns and cities, foundation of, 434, 440; decline of, 441.

NAPOLÉON I., wars of, in Italy, 308; revolution effected by, in France, 309; becomes First Consul, 309; wars of the Consulate, 309; becomes Emperor, 309; wars of the Empire, 310; contemplated invasion of England by, 310; wars of, in Spain and Portugal, 310; civil government of, 311; invasion of Russia by, and retreat therefrom, 311; subsequent wars of, 311; defeat of, at Leipsic, 311; flight of, to Elba, and return thence, 312; defeat of, at Waterloo, 312; abdication of, 312; capture and despatch of, to St. Helena, 312; résumé of the convulsions caused by, 444.

Napoleon III., establishment of the second empire in France by, 314; fixity of administration conferred by, 314; wars of the second empire, and causes thereof, 315; the Franco-German war, defeat of France, and deposition of, 316.

Native races, treatment of the, in North America, 202, 251, 263, 272, 282; intermixture with the, in Mexico and South America, 202, 428; treatment of the, in Australasia, 256, 260; treatment of the, in Peru, 430; treatment of the, in Brasil, 432.

National greatness, mistaken views of, 450.

Näfels, battle of, 395.

Netherlands, why so called, 390; early history of the, 390; principal cities of the, 391; condition of the, in the time of Charles V., 391; progress of the Reformation in the, 391; Spanish cruelties in the, 391; wars of the, with Spain, 392; independence of the, 392; history of the western provinces of the, 393.

Nice and Savoy, annexation of, by France, 315.

Normans, conquest of Britain by the, 198, 207, 292; not the same nation with the French, 207; rule of the, in Britain, 208, 210; invasion of France by the, 198, 291; settlement of, in Normandy, 291; invasion of Italy, and conquests by the, 406.

Norway, formation of a regular government in, 387; introduction of Christianity into, 387; union of, with Denmark, 387; amalgamation of, with Sweden, 388; German dynasty in, and secession of Sweden from, 388; wrested from Denmark and annexed to Sweden, 389; present condition of, 389.

Novara, battle of, 408.

OLEG, regent in Russia, acquisition of territory by, 352.

Olga, regent in Russia, conversion of, 352.

Othman, founder of the Ottoman power, 410.

Otho the Great, deposition of Pope John and election of Pope Leo VIII. by, 324.

Oudenarde, battle of, 215, 303.

PPAPAL consecration for confirmation of the imperial title, 322; repudiated by the Pragmatic-Sanction, 332.

Papal election, right of, claimed by the emperors of Germany, 325.

Parliamentary system of England, 220.

Paul of Russia, reign of, 368; alliance of, with Napoleon I. against England, 369; murder of, 369.

People, movements of the, 437; development of the, 443.

Persia, 422.

Persia, object of Russian advances in Central Asia, 245; conquest of, by the Arabian Kaliphs, 422; flight of the Parsees from, 422; history of the occupation of, by the Kaliphs, 422; subsequent history of, 422; conquest of, by Haläku, 422; expulsion of the Afghäns from, 423; defeat of the Russians and Turks by, 423; Nädir Shah king of, 423; further wars of Russia with, 423; decline of, 423; government of, 423.

Peter the Great of Russia, plot against, 364; barbarities of, 364, 365; formation of an army by, 364; formation of a navy by, 364; travels of, 364; undertakings and achievements of, 365; foundation of St. Petersburg and Cronstadt by, 366; death-bed exclamation of, 366; military achievements of, 366; battle of Pultowa gained by, 366; death of, 367; alleged Will of, 378.

Peter III. of Russia, mad order of, threatening the beards of the clergy, 367.

Peru, 429.

Peru, government of the Incas in, 429; first visit of Pizarro to, 430; acquisition of, by the Spaniards, 430; insurrection of the natives in, 430; esta-

- bliishment of the royal power in, 430; oppressions in, 430; second insurrection of the natives of, 431; rebellion of the Spanish Americans in, and
 success, 431; freedom of the people from taxation in, 431.
- Pizarro, conquest of Peru by, 398, 430.
- Pocohontas, poetical tale of, 264.
- Poitiers, battle of, 212.
- Poland, partition of, 340, 368.
- Pontificate, establishment of, 322, 405, 435.
- Pope Adrian I., support of, by Charlemagne, and Charlemagne made emperor of the West by, 322.
- Popes, deposition of the, by the emperors of Germany, 324, 325; quarrels of the emperors with the, 324, 325, 327, 328, 332; advantage of the power of excommunication exercised by the, 329.
- Portugal*, 401.
- Portugal, early history of, 401; conquered from the Moors, 401; aggrandizement of, 401; geographical discoveries of, 402; conquests and settlements of, in the East Indies, 402; inquisition in, 402; usurpation of the crown of, by the king of Spain, 403; disadvantages of the arrangement to, 403; independence regained by, 403; occupation of, by Napoleon I., 403; flight of the Court from, 403; British interference in, 403; expulsion of the French from, 404; return of the Portuguese Court to, 404; subsequent history of, 404.
- Pragmatic Sanction, publication of the, 332.
- Prague, treaty of, dissolving the Germanic confederation, 343.
- PREFATORY REMARKS, 195.
- Presburg, treaty of, for subverting the Germanic constitution, 341.
- Printing, discovery of, 443.
- Progress, course of, 197; all countries not qualified for, 202.
- Protestantism and Catholicism, dissensions between, 298, 299, 336, 337, 391, 398, 442.
- Prussia, acquired by conquest by the Teutonic knights, 330; secular kingdom of, founded by Albert of Brandenburg, 330, 339; title of king of, obtained by Frederick I., 330, 340; acquisitions of, by the partition of Poland, 340; formation of a large army by Frederick II., king of, 340; discord of, with Austria, 342; war of, with Denmark, and then with Austria, 343; dissolution of the confederation and unification of Germany by, 343.
- Pultowa, battle of, 366, 388.
- Pyramids, battle of the, 309.
- Q**UEBEC, battle of, 304.
- R**AMILLIES, battle of, 215, 303.
- Reformation of religion, 213, 298, 336, 391, 407, 434, 441.
- Reformation of religion in Germany, 336; opposed by Charles V. and condemned by the Diet at Spire, 336; fought for by the Lutheran princes aided by Sweden, France, and Denmark, 327; established by the peace of Westphalia, 337.
- Reformers, persecution of the, in France, 298, 302; escape of the, from France, 302; hostility to the, in Germany, 336; success of the, in Germany, 337; persecution of the, in the Netherlands, 391.

Résunt, 434.

Rheims, story of the vase of, 289.

Rhine frontier, definition of the, 299; wars for the, 299, 309, 316, 317, 345.

Richelieu, vigorous administration of, in France, 301; freedom crushed out by, 301.

Romans, the, in Britain, 205; rule of the, in Britain, 208; in France, 288; in Spain, 396.

Rurik, establishment of a grand-principality in Russia by, 352.

Russia, 350.

Russia, India not conquerable by, 243, 383; probable wish of, to subvert Persia and Turkey, 245, 381; extent and character of, 350; republic of Novogorod in, 351; dominion founded by the Varangians in, 351; private appanages in, 353, 355; establishment of Christianity in, 354; dissemination of civilisation in, 354; made European by Vladimir and Yaroslav, 355; epochs in the history of, 355; progress during the first historical period of, 355; relapse during the second historical period of, 355; princes of note during the second historical period of, 356; subjugation of, by the Tartars in the third historical period of, 357, 434, 439; princes of, not unthroned, 357; reunion of private appanages in, 357; removal of the seat of government of, from Vladimir to Moscow, 357; refusal of tribute to the Golden Horde by, 358; destruction of the Golden Horde and liberation of, 359; complete restoration of, by Ivan IV., 359; formation of a standing army in, 359; annexation of Siberia to, 360; reduction of the nobles and people to slavery in, 361; elevation of the house of Romanoff to the throne of, 361; review of the first four historical periods of, 362; supremacy over the Cossacks of the Ukraine acquired by, 362; revolt in, 363; reign of Peter the Great in, 363; aggrandizement of, 366; reign of Catherine II. in, 367; territorial expansion of, 367; encouragement to letters, arts, and sciences in, 368; gain of, by the partition of Poland, 368; reign of Paul, the mad emperor, in, 368; reign of Alexander I. in, 369; treaty of, with France, for the establishment of a duocracy, 369; annexation of Finland, &c., by, 370; Napoleon's invasion of, and the burning of Moscow, 370; assumption of the protection of Germany by, 370; reign of Nicholas in, 370; war of, with Turkey and her allies, 370; secret proposals by, for the partition of Turkey, 370; present extent and population of, 371; variety of races in, 371; gradual conquests of, 372; consolidation of the conquests of, 372; authority of the emperor in, 372; aristocracy of, 373; government of, 375; position of the people in, 375; advances made by, 377; commerce of, 377; progress of letters and polity in, 377; objects of, as set forth in Peter's will, 378; actual objects of, 379; position of, as civiliser of Asia, 379; civilisation of, 380.

SADOWA, battle of, 316; 343.

San Juan de Ullua, dungeons of, 429.

Saracens in Spain, development of the, 290, 396, 434.

Saxons, occupation of Britain by the, 198, 206; rule in Britain of the, 206, 209; conquest of the, in Germany, by Charlemagne, 290.

Scandinavia, history of, 386; departure of the pirate chiefs from, 387; depredations by the pirate chiefs of, 387; the Varangians of, in Russia and Byzantium, 387.

Selim I., conquest of Syria and Egypt by, 412.

Selim II, conquest of Cyprus by, 412; fleet of, destroyed, 412.

Sempach, battle of, 395.

Seven Years' War, 304, 367.

Siam, 421.

Siam, wars of, with Pegu, 421; French plot to found a Gallic empire in, 421; expulsion of the French from, 421; change of royal dynasty in, 421; intercourse of, with the British in India, 421; government of, 421.

Slave trade, abolition of the, 219, 261, 272.

Slavs, 198; in Russia, 351.

Smaller Spanish Republics, the, 431.

Solferino, battle of, 409.

Solyman, the Magnificent, defeats of the Hungarians and Germans by, 412; conquests of, 412.

Spain, 396.

Spain, early history of, 396; invasion and conquest of, by the Arabs, 396; rule of the Arabs in, 397; formation of the Christian kingdoms in, 397; wars between the Christians and Moors in, 397; conquest of the Moors in, by Ferdinand, 397; establishment of the Inquisition in, 398; expulsion of the Moriscos from, 398; decline of, 398; occupation of, by Napoleon I., and elevation of Joseph to the throne, 310, 399; active interference of the British in, 310, 399; expulsion of the French from, 310, 399; subsequent history of, 399; Carlist movement in, 400; present condition of, 400; literary celebrities of, 400.

Spanish Dominions in America, enumeration of, 427.

Spanish Succession, war of the, 398.

Spires, Diet of, condemnation of the Reformation by, 336.

St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 299.

St. James on the Birs, battle of, 395.

Sviatolaf of Russia, rejection of Christianity by, 353; creation of private appanages in the time of, 353.

Sweden, formation of a regular government in, 387; introduction of Christianity into, 387; extinction of the race of Odin in, 387; amalgamation of, with Norway and Denmark, 388; secession of, from the union, 388; introduction of the Protestant religion in, 388; era of Gustavus Adolphus in, 388; position acquired in Europe by, 388; wars of Charles XII., king of, and their results, 388; selection of Bernadotte as king of, 389; annexation of Norway to, 389; present condition of, 389; literary celebrities of, 389.

Switzerland, 393.

Switzerland, situation of, 393; early history of, 394; division of, into petty baronies, 394; forest cities of, 394; connection of, with Austria, 39; rebellion and independence of, 333, 394; wars of, with Charles the Bold, 394; further wars of, with Austria, 395; subsequent development of, 395; occupation of, by the French, 395; subversion of the constitution of, 395; annexation of, to France, 395; independence regained by, 395; present condition of, 395.

TARTARS, conquest of Russia by the, 357.

Tell, William, story of, 333.

Thirty Years' War, 337, 388.

Tilsit, treaty of, 369.

